arXiv:math/0601037v1 [math.AG] 3 Jan 2006

STRONG TOROIDALIZATION OF DOMINANT MORPHISMS OF 3-FOLDS

STEVEN DALE CUTKOSKY

1. Introduction

Suppose that $f : X \to Y$ is a dominant morphism of algebraic varieties, over a field $\mathbf{k}$ of characteristic zero. If X and Y are nonsingular, $f : X \to Y$ is toroidal if there are simple normal crossing divisors D_X on X and D_Y on Y such that $f^{-1}(D_Y) = D_X$, and f is locally given by monomials in appropriate etale local parameters on X. The precise definition of this concept is in [AK], [KKMS] and Definition 3.3 of this paper. The problem of toroidalization is to determine, given a dominant morphism $f : X \to Y$, if there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd} \tag{1}$$

such that Φ and Ψ are products of blow ups of nonsingular subvarieties, X_1 and Y_1 are nonsingular, and there exist simple normal crossing divisors D_{Y_1} on Y_1 and $D_{X_1} = f^{-1}(D_{Y_1})$ on X_1 such that f_1 is toroidal (with respect to D_{X_1} and D_{Y_1}). This is stated in Problem 6.2.1. of [AKMW].

A stronger form of toroidalization is also asked for in [AKMW], which we will call strong toroidalization. Suppose that $f : X \to Y$ is a dominant morphism of nonsingular projective varieties, D_Y is a SNC divisor on Y and $D_X = f^{-1}(D_Y)$ is a SNC divisor on X such that the locus $\mathrm{sing}(f)$ where the morphism f is not smooth is contained in D_X. The problem of strong toroidalization is to determine if there exists a commutative diagram (1) such that Φ and Ψ are products of blow ups of nonsingular centers which are supported in the preimages of D_X and D_Y respectively, and make SNCs with the respective preimages of D_X and D_Y, and f_1 is toroidal with respect to $D_{Y_1} = \Psi^{-1}(D_Y)$ and $D_{X_1} = \Phi^{-1}(D_X)$.

Toroidalization, and related concepts, have been considered earlier in different contexts, mostly for morphisms of surfaces. Strong torodialization is the strongest structure theorem which could be true for general morphisms. The concept of torodialization fails completely in positive characteristic. A simple example in characterisitc $p > 0$ is obtained from the map of curves $s = t^p(t^p + 1)$.

In the case when Y is a curve, toroidalization follows from embedded resolution of singularities ([H]). When X and Y are surfaces, there are several proofs in print ([AkK], Corollary 6.2.3 [AKMW], [CP], [Mat]). They all make use of special properties of the birational geometry of surfaces. An outline of proofs of the above cases can be found in the introduction to [C3].

In [C3], strong toroidalization is solved in the case when X is a 3-fold and Y is a surface, In Theorem 0.1 of [C5] we prove toroidalization of birational morphisms of 3-folds. In Theorem 1.1 of [C7], we prove strong toroidalization of birational morphisms

---

Research partially supported by NSF.

of 3-folds. In this paper, we prove strong toroidalization for dominant morphisms of 3-folds.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a dominant morphism of nonsingular projective 3-folds over an algebraically closed field* **k** *of characteristic 0. Further suppose that there is a simple normal crossings (SNC) divisor D_Y on Y such that $D_X = f^{-1}(D_Y)$ is a SNC divisor which contains the non smooth locus of the map f. Then there exists a commutative diagram of morphisms*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

where Φ, Ψ are products of possible blow ups for the preimages of D_X and D_Y respectively, and f_1 is toroidal with respect to $D_{Y_1} = \Psi^{-1}(D_Y)$ and $D_{X_1} = \Phi^{-1}(D_X)$.

A 3-fold over a field **k** is an abstract variety over **k** of dimension 3.

A possible blow up on a nonsingular 3-fold with toroidal structure is the blow up of a point or a nonsingular curve contained in the toroidal structure which makes SNCs with the toroidal structure.

We deduce Theorem 1.1 from the following strong toroidalization theorem for morphisms of (possibly singular) varieties.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a dominant morphism of 3-folds over an algebraically closed field* **k** *of characteristic 0. Further suppose that there is an equidimensional codimension 1 reduced subscheme D_Y of Y such that D_Y contains the singular locus of Y, and $D_X = f^{-1}(D_Y)$ contains the non smooth locus of the map f. Then there exists a commutative diagram of morphisms*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

where Φ, Ψ are products of blow ups of nonsingular curves and points supported above D_X and D_Y respectively, $D_{Y_1} = \Psi^{-1}(D_Y)$ is a simple normal crossings divisor on Y_1, $D_{X_1} = f_1^{-1}(D_{Y_1})$ is a simple normal crossings divisor on X_1 and f_1 is toroidal with respect to D_{Y_1} and D_{X_1}.

If we relax some of the restrictions in the definition of toroidalization, there are other constructions producing a toroidal morphism f_1, which are valid for arbitrary dimensions of X and Y. In [AK] it is shown that a diagram (1) can be constructed where Φ is weakened to being a modification (an arbitrary birational morphism). In [C1], [C2] and [C4], it is shown that a diagram (1) can be constructed where Φ and Ψ are locally products of blow ups of nonsingular centers and f_1 is locally toroidal, but the morphisms Φ, Ψ and f_1 may not be separated. This construction is obtained by patching local solutions, at least one of which contains the center of any given valuation.

2. NOTATION

Throughout this paper, **k** will be an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. A curve, surface or 3-fold is an abstract variety over **k** of respective dimension 1, 2 or 3. If X is a variety, and $p \in X$ is a nonsingular point, then regular parameters at p are regular parameters in $\mathcal{O}_{X,p}$. Formal regular parameters at p are regular parameters in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$. If X is a variety and $V \subset X$ is a subvariety, then $\mathcal{I}_V \subset \mathcal{O}_X$ will denote the ideal sheaf of V. If V and W are subvarieties of a variety X, we denote the scheme theoretic intersection $Y = \mathrm{spec}(\mathcal{O}_X/\mathcal{I}_V + \mathcal{I}_W)$ by $Y = V \cdot W$.

Let $f : X \to Y$ be a morphism of varieties. We will denote the singular locus of f by sing(f) the closed set of points $p \in X$ such that f is not smooth at p. If D is a Cartier divisor on Y, then $f^{-1}(D)$ will denote the reduced divisor $f^*(D)_{red}$.

Suppose that $a, b, c, d \in \mathbf{Q}$. Then we will write $(a, b) \le (c, d)$ if $a \le b$ and $c \le d$.

A toroidal structure on a nonsingular variety X is a simple normal crossing divisor (SNC divisor) D_X on X.

We will say that a nonsingular curve C which is a subvariety of a nonsingular 3-fold X with toroidal structure D_X makes simple normal crossings (SNCs) with D_X if for all $p \in C$, there exist regular parameters x, y, z at p such that $x = y = 0$ are local equations of C, and $xyz = 0$ contains the support of D_X at p.

Suppose that X is a nonsingular 3-fold with toroidal structure D_X. If $p \in D_X$ is on the intersection of three components of D_X then p is called a 3-point. If $p \in D_X$ is on the intersection of two components of D_X (and is not a 3-point) then p is called a 2-point. If $p \in D_X$ is not a 2-point or a 3-point, then p is called a 1-point. If C is an irreducible component of the intersection of two components of D_X, then C is called a 2-curve. $\Sigma(X)$ will denote the closed locus of 2-curves on X.

A possible center on a nonsingular 3-fold X with toroidal structure defined by a SNC divisor D_X, is a point on D_X or a nonsingular curve in D_X which makes SNCs with D_X. A possible center on a nonsingular surface S with toroidal structure defined by a SNC divisor D_S is a point on D_S. We will also call the blow up of a possible center a possible blow up.

Observe that if $\Phi : X_1 \to X$ is the blow up of a possible center, then $D_{X_1} = \Phi^{-1}(D_X)$ is a SNC divisor on X_1. Thus D_{X_1} defines a toroidal structure on X_1. All blow ups $\Phi : X_1 \to X$ considered in this paper will be of possible centers, and we will impose the toroidal structure on X_1 defined by $D_{X_1} = \Phi^{-1}(D_X)$.

By a general point q of a variety V, we will mean a point q which satisfies conditions which hold on some nontrivial open subset of V. The exact open condition which we require will generally be clear from context. By a general section of a coherent sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ on a projective variety X, we mean the section corresponding to a general point of the k-linear space $\Gamma(X, \mathcal{F})$.

If X is a variety, $\mathbf{k}(X)$ will denote the function field of X. A 0-dimensional valuation ν of $\mathbf{k}(X)$ is a valuation of $\mathbf{k}(X)$ such that $\mathbf{k}$ is contained in the valuation ring V_ν of ν and the residue field of V_ν is $\mathbf{k}$. If X is a projective variety which is birationally equivalent to X, then there exists a unique (closed) point $p_1 \in X_1$ such that V_ν dominates $\mathcal{O}_{X_1,p_1}$. p_1 is called the center of ν on X_1. If $p \in X$ is a (closed) point, then there exists a 0-dimensional valuation ν of $\mathbf{k}(X)$ such that V_ν dominates $\mathcal{O}_{X,p}$ (Theorem 37, Section 16, Chapter VI [ZS]). For $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbf{k}(X)$, $\nu(a_1), \ldots, \nu(a_n)$ are rationally dependent if there exist $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \mathbf{Z}$ which are not all zero, such that $\alpha_1\nu(a_1) + \cdots + \alpha_n\nu(a_n) = 0$ (in the value group of ν). Otherwise, $\nu(a_1), \ldots, \nu(a_n)$ are rationally independent.

If $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are indeterminates, and $M_i = \prod_{j=1}^n x_j^{a_{ij}}$ are monomials for $1 \le i \le m$, then we will denote $\mathrm{rank}(M_1, \ldots, M_m) = \mathrm{rank}(a_{ij})$.

3. TOROIDAL MORPHISMS AND PREPARED MORPHISMS

Suppose that X is a nonsingular variety with toroidal structure D_X. We will say that an ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{O}_X$ is toroidal if $\mathcal{I}$ is locally generated by monomials in local equations of components of D_X.

Suppose that $q \in X$. We say that u, v, w are (formal) permissible parameters at q (for D_X) if u, v, w are regular parameters in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,q}$ such that $u = 0$ is a local equation of D_X at q if q is a 1-point, $uv = 0$ is a local equation of D_X at q if q is a 2-point and $uvw = 0$ is a local equation of D_X at q if q is a 3-point. u, v, w are algebraic permissible parameters if we further have that $u, v, w \in \mathcal{O}_{X,q}$.

Definition 3.1. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a dominant morphism of nonsingular 3-folds with toroidal structures D_Y on Y and $D_X = f^{-1}(D_Y)$ on X such that sing$(f) \subset D_X$. Suppose that u, v, w are (possibly formal) permissible parameters at $q \in Y$. Then u, v are* **toroidal forms** *at $p \in f^{-1}(q)$ if there exist permissible parameters x, y, z in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ such that*

1. *q is a 2-point or a 3-point, p is a 1-point and*
$$u = x^a, v = x^b(\alpha + y) \tag{2}$$
where $0 \neq \alpha \in k$.
2. *q is 2-point or a 3-point, p is a 2-point and*
$$u = x^a y^b, v = x^c y^d \tag{3}$$
with $ad - bc \neq 0$.
3. *q is a 2-point or a 3-point, p is a 2-point and*
$$u = (x^a y^b)^k, v = (x^a y^b)^t(\alpha + z) \tag{4}$$
where $0 \neq \alpha \in k$, $a, b, k, t > 0$ and gcd$(a, b) = 1$.
4. *q is a 2-point or a 3-point, p is a 3-point and*
$$u = x^a y^b z^c, v = x^d y^e z^f \tag{5}$$
where
$$\mathrm{rank}\begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ d & e & f \end{pmatrix} = 2.$$
5. *q is a 1-point, p is a 1-point and*
$$u = x^a, v = y \tag{6}$$
6. *q is a 1-point, p is a 2-point and*
$$u = (x^a y^b)^k, v = z \tag{7}$$
with $a, b, k > 0$ and gcd$(a, b) = 1$

Regular parameters x, y, z as in Definition 3.1 will be called permissible parameters for u, v, w at p.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that $q \in Y$, $p \in f^{-1}(q)$ and u, v, w are permissible parameters at q such that u, v are toroidal forms at p. Then there exist permissible parameters x, y, z for u, v, w at p such that an expression of Definition 3.1 holds for u and v, and one of the following respective forms for w holds at p.*

1. *q is a 2-point or a 3-point, p is a 1-point, u, v satisfy (2) and*
$$w = g(x, y) + x^c z \tag{8}$$
where g is a series.
2. *q is 2-point or a 3-point, p is a 2-point, u, v satisfy (3) and*
$$w = g(x, y) + x^e y^f z \tag{9}$$
where g is a series.

3. *q is a 2-point or a 3-point, p is a 2-point, u, v satisfy (4) and*
$$w = g(x^a y^b, z) + x^c y^d \tag{10}$$
where g is a series and rank$(u, x^c y^d) = 2$.
4. *q is a 2-point or a 3-point, p is a 3-point, u, v satisfy (5) and*
$$w = g(x, y, z) + N \tag{11}$$
where g is a series in monomials M in x, y, z such that rank$(u, v, M) = 2$, and N is a monomial in x, y, z such that rank$(u, v, N) = 3$.
5. *q is a 1-point, u, v satisfy (6) and*
$$w = g(x, y) + x^c z \tag{12}$$
where g is a series.
6. *q is a 1-point, p is a 2-point, u, v satisfy (7) and*
$$w = g(x^a y^b, z) + x^c y^d \tag{13}$$
where g is a series and rank$(u, x^c y^d) = 2$.

Lemma 3.2 and its proof are Lemma 3.2 [C5].

Definition 3.3. *(*[KKMS], [AK]*) A normal variety $\overline{X}$ with a SNC divisor $D_{\overline{X}}$ on $\overline{X}$ is called toroidal if for every point $p \in \overline{X}$ there exists an affine toric variety X_σ, a point $p' \in X_\sigma$ and an isomorphism of k-algebras*
$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\overline{X},p} \cong \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_\sigma,p'}$$
such that the ideal of $D_{\overline{X}}$ corresponds to the ideal of $X_\sigma - T$ (where T is the torus in X_σ). Such a pair (X_σ, p') is called a local model at $p \in \overline{X}$. $D_{\overline{X}}$ is called a toroidal structure on $\overline{X}$.

A dominant morphism $\Phi : \overline{X} \to \overline{Y}$ of toroidal varieties with SNC divisors $D_{\overline{Y}}$ on $\overline{Y}$ and $D_{\overline{X}} = \Phi^{-1}(D_{\overline{Y}})$ on $\overline{X}$, is called toroidal at $p \in \overline{X}$, and we will say that p is a toroidal point of Φ if with $q = \Phi(p)$, there exist local models (X_σ, p') at p, (Y_τ, q') at q and a toric morphism $\Psi : X_\sigma \to Y_\tau$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\overline{X},p} & \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_\sigma,p'} \arrow[l] \\
\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\overline{Y},q} \arrow[u, "\hat{\Phi}^*"] & \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y_\tau,q'}. \arrow[l] \arrow[u, "\hat{\Psi}^*"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

$\Phi : \overline{X} \to \overline{Y}$ is called toroidal (with respect to $D_{\overline{Y}}$ and $D_{\overline{X}}$) if Φ is toroidal at all $p \in \overline{X}$.

The following is the list of toroidal forms for a dominant morphism $f : X \to Y$ of nonsingular 3-folds with toroidal structure D_Y and $D_X = f^{-1}(D_X)$. Suppose that $p \in D_X$, $q = f(p) \in D_Y$, and f is toroidal at p. Then there exist permissible parameters u, v, w at q and permissible parameters x, y, z for u, v, w at p such that one of the following forms hold:

1. p is a 3-point and q is a 3-point,
$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a y^b z^c \\ v &= x^d y^e z^f \\ w &= x^g y^h z^i, \end{aligned}$$
where $a, b, d, e, f, g, h, i \in \mathbf{N}$ and
$$\mathrm{Det}\begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ d & e & f \\ g & h & i \end{pmatrix} \neq 0.$$

2. p is a 2-point and q is a 3-point,
$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a y^b \\ v &= x^d y^e \\ w &= x^g y^h (z+\alpha) \end{aligned}$$
with $0 \neq \alpha \in k$ and $a,b,d,e,g,h \in \mathbf{N}$ satisfy $ae-bd \neq 0$.
3. p is a 1-point and q is a 3-point,
$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= x^d (y+\alpha) \\ w &= x^g (z+\beta) \end{aligned}$$
with $0 \neq \alpha, \beta \in k$, $a,d,g > 0$.
4. p is a 2-point and q is a 2-point,
$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a y^b \\ v &= x^d y^e \\ w &= z \end{aligned}$$
with $ae-bd \neq 0$
5. p is a 1-point and q is a 2-point,
$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= x^d (y+\alpha) \\ w &= z \end{aligned}$$
with $0 \neq \alpha \in k$, $a,d > 0$.
6. p is a 1-point and q is a 1-point,
$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= y \\ w &= z \end{aligned}$$
with $a > 0$.

Definition 3.4. *Let notation be as in Definition 3.1. u,v,w have a (non toroidal)* **monomial form** *at $p \in f^{-1}(q)$ if*

1. *u,v have a form (2) at p, q is a 2-point and $w = x^c(z+\alpha)$ for some $c \in \mathbf{N}$ with $c > 0$, $\alpha \in \mathbf{k}$.*
2. *u,v have a form (3) at p, q is a 2-point and $w = x^e y^f (z+\alpha)$ for some $e,f \in \mathbf{N}$, $e+f > 0$, $\alpha \in \mathbf{k}$.*
3. *u,v have a form (4) at p and $w = x^c y^d$ with $ad-bc \neq 0$.*
4. *u,v have a form (5) at p, q is a 2-point and $w = x^g y^h z^i$ with*
$$det\begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ d & e & f \\ g & h & i \end{pmatrix} \neq 0.$$
5. *u,v have a form (6) at p and $w = x^b(z+\alpha)$ with $b \in \mathbf{N}$, $b > 0$, $\alpha \in \mathbf{k}$.*
6. *u,v have a form (7) at p and $w = x^c y^d$ with $ad-bc \neq 0$.*

A prepared morphism $\Phi_X : X \to S$ from a nonsingular 3-fold X to a nonsingular surface S (with respect to toroidal structures D_S and $D_X = \Phi_X^{-1}(D_S)$) is defined in Definition 6.5 [C3].

Remark 3.5. *Suppose that $f : X \to Y$ is a dominant proper morphism of nonsingular 3-folds with toroidal structures determined by SNC divisors D_Y on Y and $D_X = f^{-1}(D_Y)$ on X, and D_X contains the singular locus of the morphism f. With our assumptions on f, f is generically finite. Recall that the fundamental locus of a* *generically finite morphism* $f : X \rightarrow Y$ *of nonsingular proper varieties is* $\{p \in Y \mid \text{dim } f^{-1}(p) > 0\}$. *The fundamental locus is a closed set of codimension* ≥ 2 *in* Y. *Let* $\overline{X}$ *be the normalization of* Y *in the function field of* X, *with induced finite morphism* $\lambda : \overline{X} \rightarrow Y$. *The branch locus of* λ *is contained in the SNC divisor* D_Y. *Let* E *be an irreducible component of* D_Y. *By Abhyankar's lemma (c.f. XIII 5.3* [G]*), the irreducible components of* $\lambda^{-1}(E)$ *are disjoint. Thus the irreducible components of* D_X *which dominate* E *are disjoint.*

Definition 3.6. *A dominant morphism* $f : X \rightarrow Y$ *of nonsingular 3-folds with toroidal structures determined by SNC divisors* D_Y *on* Y, *and* $D_X = f^{-1}(D_Y)$ *on* X *such that the singular locus of* f *is contained in* D_X *is* **prepared** *for* D_Y *and* D_X *if:*

1. *If* $q \in Y$ *is a 3-point,* u, v, w *are permissible parameters at* q *and* $p \in f^{-1}(q)$, *then* u, v *and* w *are each a unit (in* $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$*) times a monomial in local equations of the toroidal structure* D_X *at* p . *Furthermore, there exists a permutation of* u, v, w *such that* u, v *are toroidal forms at* p.
2. *If* $q \in Y$ *is a 2-point,* u, v, w *are permissible parameters at* q *and* $p \in f^{-1}(q)$, *then either*
   - (a) u, v *are toroidal forms at* p *or*
   - (b) p *is a 1-point and there exist regular parameters* $x, y, z \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ *such that there is an expression*

     $$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= x^c(\gamma(x,y) + x^d z) \\ w &= y \end{aligned}$$

     where γ *is a unit series and* $x = 0$ *is a local equation of* D_X, *or*
   - (c) p *is a 2-point and there exist regular parameters* x, y, z *in* $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ *such that there is an expression*

     $$\begin{aligned} u &= (x^a y^b)^k \\ v &= (x^a y^b)^l(\gamma(x^a y^b, z) + x^c y^d) \\ w &= z \end{aligned}$$

     where $a, b > 0$, $gcd(a,b) = 1$, $ad - bc \neq 0$, γ *is a unit series and* $xy = 0$ *is a local equation of* D_X.
3. *If* $q \in Y$ *is a 1-point, and* $p \in f^{-1}(q)$, *then there exist permissible parameters* u, v, w *at* q *such that* u, v *are toroidal forms at* p.

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose that* X, Y *are projective,* $f : X \rightarrow Y$ *is a prepared morphism of 3-folds, and* $q \in D_Y$ *is a 1-point. Then there exist algebraic permissible parameters* u, v, w *at* q *such that a form (6) or (7) of Definition 3.1 (for this fixed choice of* u, v, w*) holds at* p *for all* $p \in f^{-1}(q)$.

Proof. Let $q \in Y$ be a 1-point, u, v, w be permissible parameters at q, $\overline{X}$ be the normalization of Y in $\mathbf{k}(X)$. We have a natural commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} X \arrow[r, "f"] \arrow[dr, "g"'] & Y \\ & \overline{X} \arrow[u, "\lambda"'] \end{tikzcd} .$$

Let $\lambda^{-1}(q) = \{q_1, \ldots, q_n\}$. Abhyankar's Lemma implies that $\overline{X}$ is nonsingular above a neighborhood of q, and there exist permissible parameters u_1, v_i, w_i at q_i and $r_i \in \mathbf{N}$ such that

$$u = u_i^{r_i}, v = v_i, w = w_i.$$

Lemma 3.5 [C5] (applied to $g : X \to \overline{X}$) implies $u_i, \alpha v_i + \beta w_i$ are toroidal forms at all points of $g^{-1}(q_i)$ for a dense open set of $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbf{k}^2$. The condition is that $u_i = \alpha v_i + \beta w_i = 0$ intersects the (nonsingular at q_i) fundamental locus of g transversally at q_i. Thus there exist $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{k}$ such that $u, \alpha v + \beta w$ are toroidal forms at all $p \in f^{-1}(q)$. $\square$

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose that $f : X \to Y$ is a prepared morphism of 3-folds and E is a component of D_X such that $f(E) = C$ is a curve which is not a 2-curve. Suppose that $q \in C$ is a 1-point. Then all formal branches of C are smooth at q, and there exist permissible parameters u, v, w at q such that $u = w = 0$ are (formal) local equations of C at q.*

Proof. Suppose that $p \in f^{-1}(q) \cap E$. There exist permissible parameters u, v, w at q such that one of the following forms hold.

p is a 1-point:

$$u = x^a, v = y, w = g(x, y) + x^n z \tag{14}$$

where $x = 0$ is a local equation of E, or

p is a 2-point:

$$u = (x^a y^b)^i, v = z, w = g(x^a y^b, z) + x^c y^d \tag{15}$$

where $a, b > 0$, $ad - bc \neq 0$ and $x = 0$ is a local equation of E.

In case (14), we have an expression $w = \phi(y) + x\Omega$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ ($n > 0$ since $f(E) = C$). $u = w - \phi(y) = 0$ is a local equation of a branch of C.

In case (15), one of the following must hold in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$:

$$w = \phi(z) + xy\Omega, \tag{16}$$

$$w = \phi(z) + xy\Omega + x^c \tag{17}$$

where $c > 0$, or

$$w = \phi(z) + xy\Omega + y^d \tag{18}$$

where $d > 0$.

In cases (16) or (17), we have

$$0 = u = w - \phi(z)$$

is a local equation of a branch of C at q.

Suppose that case (18) holds. $f(E) = C$ a curve implies that there exists an irreducible series $\Psi(\overline{x}, \overline{y})$ in a power series ring $\mathbf{k}[[\overline{x}, \overline{y}]]$ such that x divides $\Psi(v, w)$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$.

$$\Psi(v, w) = \Psi(z, \phi(z) + xy\Omega + y^d)$$

implies $\Psi(0, y^d) = 0$ (set $x = z = 0$), which implies that $\overline{x} \mid \Psi(\overline{x}, \overline{y})$. Since $\Psi(\overline{x}, \overline{y})$ is irreducible, we have that $\Psi = \overline{x}\lambda$ where λ is a unit series. This is a contradiction. $\square$

We recall Theorem 1.3 of [C7].

Theorem 3.9. *(Theorem 1.3* [C7]*) Suppose that $f : X \to Y$ is a dominant morphism of nonsingular projective 3-folds over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic zero, with toroidal structures determined by SNC divisors D_Y on Y and*

$D_X = f^{-1}(D_Y)$ on X such that D_X contains the singular locus of f. Then there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

such that Ψ and Φ are products of possible blow ups for the preimages of D_Y, D_X respectively, such that f_1 is prepared for $D_{Y_1} = \Psi^{-1}(D_Y)$ and $D_{X_1} = \Phi^{-1}(D_X)$, and D_{X_1}.

4. THE τ INVARIANT

Throughout this section, we assume that $f : X \to Y$ is a dominant morphism of nonsingular 3-folds.

Definition 4.1. *Suppose that $f : X \to Y$ is prepared.*

Suppose that $p \in X$. Define $\tau_f(p) = \tau(p) = -\infty$ if there exist permissible parameters u, v, w at q such that u, v, w are toroidal forms at p. (The existence of such formal parameters u, v, w implies the existence of algebraic permissible parameters).

Suppose that $p \in X$ is a 3-point, and $\tau(p) \neq -\infty$. Suppose that u, v, w are permissible parameters at $q = f(p)$. Then there is an expression (after possibly permuting u, v, w if q is a 3-point)

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a y^b z^c \\ v &= x^d y^e z^f \\ w &= \textstyle\sum_{i\ge 0} \alpha_i M_i + N \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where x, y, z are permissible parameters at p for u, v, w, $rank(u, v) = 2$, the sum in w is over (possibly infinitely many) monomials $M_i = x^{a_i} y^{b_i} z^{c_i}$ in x, y, z such that $rank(u, v, M_i) = 2$, $deg(M_i) \le deg(M_j)$ if $i < j$, N is a monomial in x, y, z such that $rank(u, v, N) = 3$ and $N \not| M_i$ for any M_i in the series $\sum \alpha_i M_i$.

If q is a 3-point and u, v, w is not a toroidal form (at p), we necessarily have (since f is prepared) that

$$\sum \alpha_i M_i = M_0 \gamma \tag{20}$$

where γ is a unit series in the monomials $\frac{M_i}{M_0}$ (in x, y, z) such that

$$rank(u, v, M_0) = rank(u, v, \frac{M_i}{M_0}) = 2$$

for all i, and $M_0 \mid N$.

Define a group $H_p = H_{f,p}$ as follows. The Laurent monomials in x, y, z form a group under multiplication. We define $H_p = H_{f,p}$ to be the subgroup generated by u, v and the terms M_i appearing in the expansion (19). We will write the group H_p additively as:

$$H_p = H_{f,p} = (a, b, c)\mathbf{Z} + (d, e, f)\mathbf{Z} + \sum (a_i, b_i, c_i)\mathbf{Z}.$$

Define a subgroup A_p of H_p by:

$$A_p = A_{f,p} = \begin{cases} (a, b, c)\mathbf{Z} + (d, e, f)\mathbf{Z} + (a_0, b_0, c_0)\mathbf{Z} & \text{if } q \text{ is 3-point} \\ (a, b, c)\mathbf{Z} + (d, e, f)\mathbf{Z} & \text{if } q \text{ is a 2-point.} \end{cases}$$

Define

$$L_p = L_{f,p} = H_p/A_p,$$
$$\tau(p) = \tau_f(p) = \mid L_p \mid .$$

Suppose that $p \in X$ is a 2-point, and $\tau(p) \neq -\infty$. Suppose that u, v, w are permissible parameters at $q = f(p)$ (which satisfy the conclusions of Lemma 5.4 if $f(p) = q$ is a 1-point). Then there is an expression (after possibly permuting u, v, w if $q = f(p)$ is a 3-point) of one the following forms:

q is 2-point or a 3-point:

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = x^ay^b \\ v & = x^cy^d \\ w & = \sum_{i\geq 0}\alpha_{ij}x^iy^j + x^ey^f(z+\beta) \end{array} \tag{21}$$

where x, y, z are permissible parameters at p for u, v, w, and $x^ey^f \not| x^{a_i}y^{b_i}$ for all i, or

q is a 2-point or a 3-point:

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = (x^ay^b)^k \\ v & = (x^ay^b)^t(z+\beta) \\ w & = \sum_{i\geq 0}\alpha_i(z)(x^ay^b)^i + x^cy^d \end{array} \tag{22}$$

where $gcd(a, b) = 1$, x, y, z are permissible parameters at p for u, v, w, and $x^cy^d \not| (x^ay^b)^i$ for all i, or

q is a 2-point:

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = (x^ay^b)^k \\ v & = \sum \alpha_i(z)(z^ay^b)^i + x^cy^d \\ w & = z \end{array} \tag{23}$$

where $gcd(a, b) = 1$, x, y, z are permissible parameters at p for u, v, w, and $x^cy^d \not| (x^ay^b)^i$ for all i, or

q is a 1-point:

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = (x^ay^b)^k \\ v & = z \\ w & = \sum_{i\geq 0}\alpha_i(z)(x^ay^b)^i + x^cy^d \end{array} \tag{24}$$

where $gcd(a, b) = 1$, x, y, z are permissible parameters at p for u, v, w, and $x^cy^d \not| (x^ay^b)^i$ for all i.

If q is a 3-point, we necessarily have (since f is prepared) that

$$w = M_0\gamma \tag{25}$$

where γ is a unit series.

In equation (23), we have

$$v = (x^ay^b)^{i_0}\gamma \tag{26}$$

where γ is a unit series.

Suppose that (21) holds. Then define

$$\tau(p) = \ell\left(((a,b)\mathbf{Z} + (c,d)\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{\alpha_{ij}\neq 0}(i,j)\mathbf{Z})/((a,b)\mathbf{Z} + (c,d)\mathbf{Z})\right)$$

if q is a 2-point,

$$\tau(p) = \ell\left(((a,b)\mathbf{Z} + (c,d)\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{\alpha_{ij}\neq 0}(a_i,b_i)\mathbf{Z})/((a,b)\mathbf{Z} + (c,d)\mathbf{Z} + (a_0,b_0)\mathbf{Z})\right)$$

if q is a 3-point, and $M_0 = x^{a_0}y^{b_0}$ in (25).

Suppose that (22) holds. Then define

$$\tau(p) = \ell\left((k\mathbf{Z} + t\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{\alpha_i \neq 0} i\mathbf{Z})/(k\mathbf{Z} + t\mathbf{Z})\right)$$

if q is a 2-point,

$$\tau(p) = \ell\left((k\mathbf{Z} + t\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{\alpha_i \neq 0} i\mathbf{Z})/(k\mathbf{Z} + t\mathbf{Z} + i_0\mathbf{Z})\right)$$

if q is a 3-point, and $M_0 = x^{i_0}\gamma$ in (25).

Suppose that (23) (and (26)) hold. Then define

$$\tau(p) = \ell\left((k\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{\alpha_i \neq 0} i\mathbf{Z})/(k\mathbf{Z} + i_0\mathbf{Z})\right).$$

Suppose that (24) holds. Then define

$$\tau(p) = \ell\left((k\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{\alpha_i \neq 0} i\mathbf{Z})/k\mathbf{Z}\right).$$

Suppose that $p \in X$ is a 1-point, and $\tau(p) \neq -\infty$. Suppose that u, v, w are permissible parameters at $q = f(p)$ which satisfy the conclusions of Lemma 5.4 if $f(p) = q$ is a 1-point. Then there is an expression (after possibly permuting u, v, w if $q = f(p)$ is a 3-point) of one the following forms:

q is 2-point or a 3-point

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= x^b(\alpha + y) \\ w &= \textstyle\sum_{i<c} \alpha_i(y)x^i + x^c(z + \beta) \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where x, y, z are permissible parameters at p for u, v, w, or

q is 2-point

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= \textstyle\sum_{i<c} \alpha_i(y)x^i + x^c(z + \beta) \\ w &= y \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where x, y, z are permissible parameters at p for u, v, w, or

q is a 1-point

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= y \\ w &= \textstyle\sum_{i<c} \alpha_i(y)x^i + x^c(z + \beta) \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where x, y, z are permissible parameters at p for u, v, w.

In case (27) we have

$$w = x^{i_0}\gamma \tag{30}$$

where γ is a unit series if q is a 3-point. In case (28) we have

$$v = x^{i_0}\gamma \tag{31}$$

where γ is a unit series.

Suppose that (27) holds. Then define

$$\tau(p)=\ell\left((a\mathbf{Z}+b\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{\alpha_i\neq 0} i\mathbf{Z})/(a\mathbf{Z}+b\mathbf{Z})\right)$$

if q is a 2-point,

$$\tau(p)=\ell\left((a\mathbf{Z}+b\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{\alpha_i\neq 0} i\mathbf{Z})/(a\mathbf{Z}+b\mathbf{Z}+i_0\mathbf{Z})\right)$$

if q is a 3-point.

Suppose that (28) holds. Then define

$$\tau(p)=\ell\left((a\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{\alpha_i\neq 0} i\mathbf{Z})/(a\mathbf{Z}+i_0\mathbf{Z})\right).$$

Suppose that (29) holds. Then define

$$\tau(p)=\ell\left((a\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{\alpha_i\neq 0} i\mathbf{Z})/a\mathbf{Z}\right).$$

Observe that $\tau(p)<\infty$ in Definition 4.1, since H_p is a finitely generated group, and H_p/A_p is a torsion group.

We define

$$\tau(X)=\tau_f(X)=\max\{\tau_f(p)\mid p\in X\}.$$

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that $f:X\rightarrow Y$ is prepared and $p\in D_X$. Then $\tau_f(p)$ is independent of choice of permissible parameters u,v,w at $q=f(p)$ and permissible parameters x,y,z at p for u,v,w.*

Proof. This is proved in Lemma 3.10 of [C5] when p is a 3-point. We give here a proof when p is a 1-point and $q=f(p)$ is a 2-point or a 3-point. The proof in the remaining cases is similar.

This is not difficult to prove when there exists a computation of $\tau_f(p)$ which gives $-\infty$, so we will assume that $\tau_f(p)\geq 0$ for all computations of $\tau_f(p)$.

Assume that p is a 1-point, and that $q=f(p)$ is a 2-point or a 3-point. Suppose that u,v,w are permissible parameters at q, such that u,v,w have an expression of the form (2) and (27), or of the form 2 (b) of Definition 3.6 and (28).

We will first show that for fixed permissible parameters u,v,w at q, $\tau_f(p)$ is independent of choice of permissible parameters x,y,z for u,v,w at p which have an expression of type (2) (and (27).

We have that u,v,w have an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll} u &= x^a\\ v &= x^b(\alpha+y)\\ w &= \sum_{j=0}^{n}\alpha_{i_j}(y)x^{i_j}+x^c(z+\beta)\end{array}\tag{32}$$

where $i_j<c$ for all j, and $\alpha_{i_j}(y)\neq 0$ for all j.

If $\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{z}$ are other permissible parameters for u,v,w at q, which also give an expansion of type 2 (and (27)), then we have $x=\omega\overline{x}$ where $\omega^a=1$, and thus $y=\omega^{-b}\overline{y}$, $z=\omega^{-c}\overline{z}$. Thus the computation of $\tau_f(p)$ for $\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{z}$ is the same as for x,y,z.

By a similar calculation, for fixed permissible parameters u,v,w at q, we may show that τ is independent of choice of permissible parameters x,y,z for u,v,w at p which have an expression of type 2 (b) of Definition 3.6 and (28) at p.

Now suppose that q is a 2-point, and u,v,w admit expressions of both the form 2 (b) of Definition 3.6 and of the form (2) at p. Let τ_1 be the computation of $\tau_f(p)$ from a representation of u,v,w in the form 2 (b) of Definition 3.6, and let τ_2 be the computation of $\tau_f(p)$ from a representation of u,v,w in the form of (2).

Since u,v,w have an expression of type 2 (b) at p, there are permissible parameters x,y,z at p such that there is an expression

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a\\ v &= \textstyle\sum_{j=0}^{n}\alpha_{i_j}(y)x^{i_j}+x^c(z+\beta)\\ w &= y \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

of the form (28), where α_{ij} are all nonzero and $i_j<c$ for all j. τ_1 is the computation of $\tau_f(p)$ for this expression, since u,v,w also have an expression of type (2) at p, as u,v are toroidal forms at p. Since $\tau_1\ge 0$, we have

$$v=(\overline{\alpha}+y\lambda(y))x^{i_0}+\alpha_{i_1}(y)x^{i_1}+\cdots+\alpha_{i_n}(y)x^{i_n}+x^c(z+\beta)$$

where $0\ne\overline{\alpha}=\alpha_{i_0}(0)\in\mathbf{k}$ and $\lambda(y)$ is a unit series. Set

$$\overline{y}=y\lambda(y)+\alpha_{i_1}(y)x^{i_1-i_0}+\cdots+\alpha_{i_n}(y)x^{i_n-i_0}+x^{c-i_0}(z+\beta).$$

Then

$$y=\lambda(y)^{-1}\overline{y}-\lambda(y)^{-1}\alpha_{i_1}(y)x^{i_1-i_0}-\cdots-\lambda(y)^{-1}\alpha_{i_n}(y)x^{i_n-i_0}-x^{c-i_0}\lambda(y)^{-1}(z+\beta). \tag{34}$$

Iterate, substituting (34) into successive iterations of (34), to get a series $\overline{P}$ such that

$$y=\overline{P}(\overline{y},x^{i_1-i_0},\ldots,x^{i_n-i_0})+x^{c-i_0}\Omega$$

for some $\Omega\in\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$.

We compute the Jacobian determinant

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\begin{array}{c}\partial(u,v,w)\\ \partial(x,y,z)\end{array}\right)=-ax^{a+c-1}. \tag{35}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a\\ v &= x^{i_0}(\overline{y}+\overline{\alpha})\\ w &= \overline{P}(\overline{y},x^{i_1-i_0},\ldots,x^{i_n-i_0})+x^{c-i_0}\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\begin{array}{c}\partial(u,v,w)\\ \partial(x,\overline{y},z)\end{array}\right)=ax^{a+c-1}\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial z}. \tag{36}$$

Since (35) and (36) differ by multiplication of a unit series, $\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial z}(0,0,0)\ne 0$. Set $\overline{\beta}=\Omega(0,0,0)$, $\overline{z}=\Omega-\overline{\beta}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a\\ v &= x^{i_0}(\overline{y}+\alpha)\\ w &= \overline{P}(\overline{y},x^{i_1-i_0},\ldots,x^{i_n-i_0})+x^{c-i_0}(\overline{\beta}+\overline{z}). \end{aligned}$$

τ_2 is the value of $\tau_f(p)$ for this expression, computed from (27). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_2 &\le \ell\left((a\mathbf{Z}+i_0\mathbf{Z}+\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n}(i_j-i_0)\mathbf{Z})/(a\mathbf{Z}+i_0\mathbf{Z})\right)\\ &= \ell\left((a\mathbf{Z}+\textstyle\sum_{j=0}^{n}i_j\mathbf{Z})/(a\mathbf{Z}+i_0\mathbf{Z})\right)\\ &= \tau_1. \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

We now show that $\tau_1 \le \tau_2$. Since u, v, w have an expression of type (2) at p, we have an expression

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= x^b(\alpha + y) \\ w &= P(x,y) + x^c(z+\beta) \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

of the form (27), where

$$P = \alpha_{i_0}(y) + \alpha_{i_1}(y)x^{i_1} + \cdots + \alpha_{i_n}(y)x^{i_n},$$

$\alpha_{i_j}(y) \ne 0$ for all j, and $i_n < c$.

τ_2 is the computation of $\tau_f(p)$ for this expression. Since $\tau_2 \ge 0$, and u, v, w also have an expression of type 2 (b) of Definition 3.6, we have $\frac{\partial P}{\partial y}(0,0) \ne 0$. We then have

$$\alpha_{i_0}(y) = y\lambda(y)$$

where λ is a unit series. Set $\overline{z} = P + x^c(z+\beta)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} y &= \lambda(y)^{-1}[\overline{z} - \alpha_{i_1}(y)x^{i_1} - \cdots - \alpha_{i_n}(y)x^{i_n} - x^c(z+\beta)] \\ &= \lambda(y)^{-1}\overline{z} - \lambda(y)^{-1}\alpha_{i_1}(y)x^{i_1} - \cdots - \lambda(y)^{-1}\alpha_{i_n}(y)x^{i_n} - \lambda(y)^{-1}x^c(z+\beta). \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Iterate, substituting (39) into successive iterations of (39), to get series $\overline{P}$ and Ω such that

$$y = \overline{P}(\overline{z}, x^{i_1}, \ldots, x^{i_n}) + x^c\Omega(\overline{z}, x, z).$$

Thus we have an expression

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= x^b(\alpha + \overline{P}(\overline{z}, x^{i_1}, \ldots, x^{i_n})) + x^{b+c}\Omega \\ w &= \overline{z}. \end{aligned}$$

We compute the Jacobian determinant from (38),

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\begin{array}{c} \partial(u,v,w) \\ \partial(x,y,z) \end{array}\right) = ax^{a+b+c-1}.$$

We compare with

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\begin{array}{c} \partial(u,v,w) \\ \partial(x,z,\overline{z}) \end{array}\right) = ax^{a+b+c-1}\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial z},$$

to see that $\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial z}(0,0,0) \ne 0$. Set $\overline{\beta} = \Omega(0,0,0)$, $\overline{y} = \Omega - \overline{\beta}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= x^b(\alpha + \overline{P}(\overline{z}, x^{i_1}, \ldots, x^{i_n})) + x^{b+c}(\overline{\beta} + \overline{y}) \\ w &= \overline{z} \end{aligned}$$

in the form of 2 (b) of Definition 3.6. τ_1 is the value of $\tau_f(p)$ for this expression. We compute from (28),

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_1 &\le \ell\left((a\mathbf{Z} + b\mathbf{Z} + \textstyle\sum_{j=0}^n i_j\mathbf{Z})/(a\mathbf{Z} + b\mathbf{Z})\right) \\ &= \tau_2. \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

By (37) and (40) we see that $\tau_1 = \tau_2$.

From our calculations so far, we conclude that for fixed u, v, w, $\tau_f(p)$ is independent of choice of permissible parameters x, y, z for u, v, w at p.

Now we will show that if u_1, v_1, w_1 are a permutation of u, v, w such that u_1, v_1, w_1 have one of the forms (2) and (27) or 2 (b) of Definition 3.6 and (28) at p, then we obtain the same value of $\tau_f(p)$.

First suppose that $u_1 = v, v_1 = u$, $w_1 = w$, and u, v are toroidal forms at p (so that (2) holds). Then u, v, w have an expression (32) at p. We have

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 = v \quad &= \overline{x}^b \\ v_1 = u \quad &= \overline{x}^a(\overline{\alpha} + \overline{y}) \end{aligned}$$

where $x = \overline{x}(\alpha + y)^{-\frac{1}{b}}$, $\overline{\alpha} = \alpha^{-\frac{a}{b}}$, and $y = \lambda(\overline{y})\overline{y}$ for an appropriate unit series $\lambda(\overline{y})$.

Set

$$\overline{\beta} = \beta\alpha^{-\frac{c}{b}}, \overline{z} = (z + \beta)(\alpha + \lambda(\overline{y})\overline{y})^{-\frac{c}{b}} - \overline{\beta}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} w \quad &= \textstyle\sum_{j=0}^{n} \alpha_{i_j}(\lambda(\overline{y})\overline{y})(\alpha + \lambda(\overline{y})\overline{y})^{-\frac{i_j}{b}}\overline{x}^{i_j} + \overline{x}^c(z + \beta)(\alpha + \lambda(\overline{y})\overline{y})^{-\frac{c}{b}} \\ &= \textstyle\sum_{j=0}^{n} \overline{\alpha}_{ij}(\overline{y})\overline{x}^{i_j} + \overline{x}^c(\overline{\beta} + \overline{z}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{\alpha}_{ij}(\overline{y}) \neq 0$ for all j.

Let τ_1 be the calculation of $\tau_f(p)$ for the variables u, v, w, and let τ_2 be the calculation of τ for the variables u_1, v_1, w_1. We see that $\tau_1 = \tau_2$.

Now suppose that $u_1 = v, v_1 = u, w_1 = w$, and u, v, w have an expression of the form 2 (b) of Definition 3.6 and (28). u, v, w have an expression (33) at p. We have

$$\begin{aligned} u \quad &= x^a \\ v \quad &= x^{i_0}(\textstyle\sum_{j=0}^{n} \alpha_{i_j}(y)x^{i_j - i_0} + x^{c - i_0}(z + \beta)) \\ w \quad &= y \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha_{i_0}(y)$ is a unit series. Set

$$\gamma = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \alpha_{i_j}(y)x^{i_j - i_0} + x^{c - i_0}(z + \beta).$$

Define $\overline{x}$ by

$$x = \overline{x}\gamma^{-\frac{1}{i_0}}. \tag{41}$$

We have a series P and $\Omega \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 \quad &= v = \overline{x}^{i_0} \\ v_1 \quad &= u = \overline{x}^a\gamma^{-\frac{a}{i_0}} = \overline{x}^a(P(y, x^{i_1 - i_0}, \ldots, x^{i_n - i_0}) + \overline{x}^{c - i_0}\Omega) \\ w \quad &= y \end{aligned}$$

By iterating substitution of (41) in $P(y, x^{i_1 - i_0}, \ldots, x^{i_n - i_0})$, we see that there is a series $\overline{P}(y, \overline{x}^{i_1 - i_0}, \ldots, \overline{x}^{i_n - i_0})$ and $\overline{\Omega} \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ such that

$$v_1 = \overline{x}^a(\overline{P}(y, \overline{x}^{i_1 - i_0}, \ldots, \overline{x}^{i_n - i_0}) + \overline{x}^{c - i_0}\overline{\Omega}).$$

Since the Jacobians

$$\mathrm{Det}\begin{pmatrix} \dfrac{\partial(u, v, w)}{\partial(x, y, z)} \end{pmatrix} = -ax^{a + c - 1}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Det}\begin{pmatrix} \dfrac{\partial(u_1, v_1, w_1)}{\partial(\overline{x}, y, z)} \end{pmatrix} = -i_0\overline{x}^{a + c - 1}\frac{\partial\overline{\Omega}}{\partial z}$$

differ by multiplication by a unit, $\frac{\partial\overline{\Omega}}{\partial z}(0, 0, 0) \neq 0$.

Set

$$\overline{\beta} = \overline{\Omega}(0, 0, 0),\ \overline{z} = \Omega - \overline{\beta}.$$

Then $\overline{x}, y, \overline{z}$ are regular parameters in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 \quad &= \overline{x}^{i_0} \\ v_1 \quad &= \overline{x}^a\overline{P}(y, \overline{x}^{i_1 - i_0}, \ldots, \overline{x}^{i_n - i_0}) + \overline{x}^{a + c - i_0}(\overline{\beta} + \overline{z}) \\ w \quad &= y. \end{aligned}$$

Let τ_1 be the calculation of $\tau_f(p)$ for the variables u, v, w, and let τ_2 be the calculation of $\tau_f(p)$ for the variables u_1, v_1, w_1 (from (28). We see that $\tau_1 \le \tau_2$. From this argument for the change of variables u_1, v_1, w_1 to u, v, w, we see that $\tau_2 \le \tau_1$, so that $\tau_1 = \tau_2$.

Now suppose that q is a 3-point, u, v, w have an expression (2) and (27), and $u_1 = w, v_1 = v, w_1 = u$ also have an expression (2) and (27).

We have

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= x^b(\alpha + y) \\ w &= x^{i_0}(\textstyle\sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_{i_j}(y)x^{i_j - i_0} + x^{c-i_0})(z+\beta)) \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where $n < c$, $\alpha_{i_j}(y) \ne 0$ for all j, and $\alpha_{i_0}(y)$ is a unit series. Set

$$\gamma = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \alpha_{i_j}(y)x^{i_j - i_0} + x^{c-i_0}(z+\beta).$$

Set $x = \overline{x}\gamma^{-\frac{1}{i_0}}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 = w &= \overline{x}^{i_0} \\ v_1 = v &= \overline{x}^b \gamma^{-\frac{b}{i_0}}(\alpha + y) \\ w_1 = u &= \overline{x}^a \gamma^{-\frac{a}{i_0}}. \end{aligned}$$

As we are assuming that all calculations of $\tau_f(p)$ are ≥ 0, we have that $c > 0$. Since w, v are assumed to be toroidal forms at p, we then have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}(\gamma^{-\frac{b}{i_0}}(\alpha + y))(0,0,0) \ne 0.$$

Set

$$\overline{\alpha} = \gamma^{-\frac{b}{i_0}}(0,0,0)\alpha,\ \overline{y} = \gamma^{-\frac{b}{i_0}}(\alpha + y) - \overline{\alpha}.$$

We have

$$x = \overline{x}[(\alpha + y)^{-1}(\overline{y} + \overline{\alpha})]^{\frac{1}{b}}. \tag{43}$$

There exists a unit series $\lambda(y)$, series $\overline{\alpha}_{r_1, \dots r_n}(y)$, and $\overline{\Omega} \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$, such that

$$\overline{y} = y\lambda(y) + \sum_{r_1, \dots, r_n > 0} \overline{\alpha}_{r_1, \dots, r_n}(y) x^{(i_1 - i_0)r_1} \cdots x^{(i_n - i_0)r_n} + x^{c - i_0}\overline{\Omega}.$$

Thus

$$y = \overline{y}\lambda(y)^{-1} - \sum_{r_1, \dots, r_n > 0} \lambda(y)^{-1}\overline{\alpha}_{r_1, \dots, r_n}(y) x^{(i_1 - i_0)r_1} \cdots x^{(i_n - i_0)r_n} - x^{c - i_0}\lambda(y)^{-1}\overline{\Omega}. \tag{44}$$

There exists a series

$$P(y, x^{i_1 - i_0}, \dots, x^{i_n - i_0}) \tag{45}$$

such that $u = \overline{x}^a(P + \overline{x}^{c - i_0}\Omega)$ for some $\Omega \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$.

Substituting (43) and (44) into successive iterations of (45), we see that there is a series $\overline{P}(\overline{y}, \overline{x}^{i_1 - i_0}, \dots, \overline{x}^{i_n - i_0})$ and $\Omega' \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ such that

$$w_1 = u = \overline{x}^a(\overline{P}(\overline{y}, \overline{x}^{i_1 - i_0}, \dots, \overline{x}^{i_n - i_0}) + \overline{x}^{c - i_0}\Omega').$$

Thus there is an expression

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 = w &= \overline{x}^{i_0} \\ v_1 = v &= \overline{x}^b(\overline{\alpha} + \overline{y}) \\ u &= \overline{x}^a(\overline{P}(\overline{y}, \overline{x}^{i_1 - i_0}, \dots, \overline{w}_1 = x^{i_n - i_0}) + \overline{x}^{c - i_0}\Omega'). \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

We compute the Jacobian determinants

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\begin{array}{c}\partial(u,v,w)\\ \partial(x,y,z)\end{array}\right)=ax^{a+b+c-1}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\begin{array}{c}\partial(u_1,v_1,w_1)\\ \partial(\overline{x},\overline{y},z)\end{array}\right)=i_0\overline{x}^{a+b+c-1}\frac{\partial\Omega'}{\partial z}.$$

Thus $\frac{\partial\Omega'}{\partial z}(0,0,0)\neq 0$. Set

$$\overline{\beta}=\Omega'(0,0,0),\ \overline{z}=\Omega'-\overline{\beta}.$$

$\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{z}$ are regular parameters in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$. We have an expression

$$\begin{array}{lll} u_1=w & =\overline{x}^{i_0} \\ v_1=v & =\overline{x}^b(\overline{\alpha}+\overline{y}) \\ w_1=u & =\overline{x}^a\overline{P}(\overline{y},\overline{x}^{i_1-i_0},\ldots,\overline{x}^{i_n-i_0})+\overline{x}^{a+c-i_0}(\overline{\beta}+\overline{z})\end{array}\tag{47}$$

of the form (27).

Let τ_1 be the computation of $\tau_f(p)$ from (47), τ_2 be the computation of $\tau_f(p)$ from (47). We see that $\tau_1\le\tau_2$.

By this argument applied to the change of variables $u_1=w,v_1=v,w_1=u$ to u,v,w, we see that $\tau_2\le\tau_1$, so that $\tau_1=\tau_2$.

There is a similar calculation if $u_1=u,v_1=w,w_1=v$.

Now all other permutations u_1,v_1,w_1 of u,v,w such that u_1,v_1,w_1 have a form (2) and (27) at p (so that u_1,v_1 are toroidal forms at p) are a composition of change of variables of the three types analyzed above. We have shown that $\tau_f(p)$ is invariant under such change of variables. Hence we get the same evaluation of $\tau_f(p)$ for all possible permuations of the variables u,v,w and u_1,v_1,w_1.

Now assume that $u_1=u,v_1=v$ and w_1 are permissible parameters at q.

Suppose that u,v,w have an expression of the form (2) at p. We then have an expression (32) of u,v,w. Let τ_1 be the computation of $\tau_f(p)$ for this expression. Set

$$P=\sum_{j=0}^{n}\alpha_{ij}(y)x^{i_j}.$$

We have an expansion

$$w_1=\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}g_i(u,v)w^i\tag{48}$$

and $w_1=w\gamma$ where $\gamma(u,v,w)$ is a unit series if $q=f(p)$ is a 3-point.

Substitute $w=P+x^c(z+\beta)$ into (48) to get

$$w_1=\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{i}g_i(u,v)\binom{i}{j}P^{i-j}x^{jc}(z+\beta)^j.$$

We see that there exists a series $\overline{P}(y,x^a,x^b,x^{i_0},\ldots,x^{i_n})$ such that

$$w_1=\overline{P}(y,x^a,x^b,x^{i_0},\ldots,x^{i_n})+x^c\Omega$$

for some series Ω. Comparing the Jacobian determinants

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\begin{array}{c}\partial(u,v,w)\\ \partial(x,y,z)\end{array}\right)=ax^{a+b+c-1}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\begin{array}{c}\partial(u,v,w_1)\\ \partial(x,y,z)\end{array}\right)=ax^{a+b+c-1}\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial z},$$

we see that $\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial z}(0,0,0)\ne 0$. Set

$$\overline{\beta}=\Omega(0,0,0),\ \overline{z}=\Omega-\overline{\beta}.$$

We have

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & =x^a\\ v & =x^b(\alpha+y)\\ w_1 & =\overline{P}(y,x^a,x^b,x^{i_0},\ldots,x^{i_n})+x^c(\overline{z}+\overline{\beta}) \end{array}$$

of the form of (27). Further, we have $w_1=x^{i_0}\overline{\gamma}$ where $\overline{\gamma}(\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{z})$ is a unit series if $q=f(p)$ is a 3-point. Let τ_2 be the computation of $\tau_f(p)$ for this expression. We see that $\tau_2\le\tau_1$. Now applying this argument to the change of variables from u,v,w_1 to u,v,w, we see that $\tau_1=\tau_2$.

Now suppose that u,v,w have an expression of the form 2 (b) of Definition 3.6 and (28) (so that $q=f(p)$ is a 2-point). We have

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & =x^a\\ v & =\sum_{j=0}^n\alpha_{i_j}(y)x^{i_j}+x^c(z+\beta)\\ w & =y \end{array}$$

where $\alpha_{i_j}(y)$ are all nonzero and $i_j<c$ for all j.

Let τ_1 be the computation of $\tau_f(p)$ for u,v,w.

By the formal implicit function theorem, there exists a unit series $\gamma(u,v,w)$ and a series $\phi(u,v)$ with $\phi(0,0)=0$ such that $w_1=\gamma(w-\phi)$. We have

$$w_1=\gamma(0,0,y)y+x\Omega$$

for some series $\Omega(x,y,z)$. We may thus set $\overline{y}=w_1$, and have that $x,\overline{y},z$ are regular parameters in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$.

There exist a unit series $\overline{\alpha}_0(y)$ and series $\overline{\alpha}_{r_0,\ldots,r_n}(y)$ such that there is an expression

$$\overline{y}=\overline{\alpha}_0(y)y+\sum_{r_0+\cdots+r_n>0}\overline{\alpha}_{r_0,\ldots,r_n}(y)x^{i_0r_0+\cdots+i_nr_n}+x^c\overline{\Omega}$$

with $\overline{\alpha}_0(0)\ne 0$.

We thus have an expression

$$y=\overline{\alpha}_0(y)^{-1}\overline{y}-\sum_{r_0+\cdots+r_n>0}\overline{\alpha}_0(y)^{-1}\overline{\alpha}_{r_0,\ldots,r_n}(y)x^{i_0r_0+\cdots+i_nr_n}+x^c\overline{\alpha}_0(y)^{-1}\overline{\Omega}. \tag{49}$$

We substitute (49) into successive iterations of

$$v=\sum_{j=0}^n\alpha_{i_j}(y)x^{i_j}+x^c(z+\beta)$$

to obtain an expression

$$v=P(\overline{y},x^{i_0},\ldots,x^{i_n})+x^c\Omega.$$

Comparing the Jacobian determinants

$$\operatorname{Det}\left(\begin{array}{c}\partial(u,v,w)\\ \partial(x,y,z)\end{array}\right)=-ax^{a+c-1}$$

and

$$\operatorname{Det}\left(\begin{array}{c}\partial(u,v,w_1)\\ \partial(x,\overline{y},z)\end{array}\right)=-ax^{a+c-1}\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial z},$$

we see that $\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial z}(0,0,0)\ne 0$. Set

$$\overline{\beta}=\Omega(0,0,0),\ \overline{z}=\Omega-\overline{\beta}.$$

$x, \overline{y}, \overline{z}$ are regular parameters in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$, and we have an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = x^a \\ v & = \overline{P}(x^{i_0}, \ldots, x^{i_n}) + x^c(\overline{z} + \overline{\beta}) \\ w_1 & = \overline{y} \end{array}$$

of the form of (28). Let τ_2 be the computation of $\tau_f(p)$ for u, v, w_1. We have $\tau_2 \le \tau_1$. Now applying this argument to the change of variables from u, v, w_1 to u, v, w, we see that $\tau_1 = \tau_2$.

Using the above techniques, we can show that we have the same computation of $\tau_f(p)$ for a change of variables

$$u_1 = \lambda_1 u, v_1 = \lambda_2 v, w_1 = w$$

where λ_1, λ_2 are unit series.

Finally, suppose that u_1, v_1, w_1 are arbitrary permissible parameters at q. Then u_1, v_1, w_1 may be obtained from u, v, w be a series of changes of variables of the types considered above. It follows that the computation of $\tau_f(p)$ for the variables u, v, w and u_1, v_1, w_1 are the same.

$\square$

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that $f : X \to Y$ is prepared. Then τ_f is upper semi continuous on D_X.*

Proof. This follows from a local calculation, computing a deformation in etale local coordinates of the possible prepared forms.

Suppose that $p^* \in X$. We must find a Zariski open neighborhood U of p^* in X such that $p \in U \cap D_X$ implies $\tau_f(p) \le \tau_f(p^*)$.

We work out a few cases. Suppose that $p* \in X$ is a 3-point, $\tau_f(p^*) \ge 0$ and there exist (algebraic) permissible parameters u, v, w at $q* = f(p*)$ such that u, v are toroidal forms at $p*$. Then there exist regular parameters $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z} \in \mathcal{O}_{X,p*}$, and units $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{O}_{X,p*}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = \tilde{x}^a \tilde{y}^b \tilde{z}^c \gamma_1 \\ v & = \tilde{x}^d \tilde{y}^e \tilde{z}^f \gamma_2 \end{array}$$

with

$$\text{rank} \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ d & e & f \end{pmatrix} = 2.$$

There exist rational numbers $\overline{a}_{ij}$ such that if we set

$$x = \tilde{x}\gamma_1^{\overline{a}_{11}}\gamma_2^{\overline{a}_{12}}, y = \tilde{x}\gamma_1^{\overline{a}_{21}}\gamma_2^{\overline{a}_{22}}, z = \tilde{x}\gamma_1^{\overline{a}_{31}}\gamma_2^{\overline{a}_{32}},$$

then

$$u = x^a y^b z^c, \ v = x^d y^e z^f.$$

From the Jacobian determinant

$$\text{Det} \left(\begin{array}{c} \partial(u, v, w) \\ \partial(x, y, z) \end{array} \right)$$

we see that we have an expansion

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = x^a y^b z^c \\ v & = x^d y^e z^f \\ w & = \sum_{i \ge 0} \alpha_i x^{a_i} y^{b_i} z^{c_i} + x^g y^h z^i \gamma \end{array} \tag{50}$$

where γ is a unit series,

$$\text{Det} \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ d & e & f \\ g & h & i \end{pmatrix} \ne 0,$$

and for all i, $\alpha_i\ne 0$,

$$\mathrm{Det}\begin{pmatrix} a & b & c\\ d & e & f\\ a_i & b_i & c_i\end{pmatrix}=0,$$

and $(a_i,b_i,c_i)\not\geq(g,h,i)$.

We can compute $\tau_f(p^*)$ by changing variables, multiplying x,y,z by appropriate rational powers of γ. We obtain that

$$\begin{array}{ll} u &= \hat x^a\hat y^b\hat z^c\\ v &= \hat x^d\hat y^e\hat z^f\\ w &= \sum_{i\ge 0}\alpha_i\hat x^{a_i}\hat y^{b_i}\hat z^{c_i}+\hat x^g\hat y^h\hat z^i.\end{array}$$

Thus

$$\tau_f(p^*)=\ell\left(((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{i\ge 0}(a_i,b_i,c_i)\mathbf{Z})/((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z})\right)$$

if q^* is a 2-point,

$$\tau_f(p^*)=\ell\left(((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+\sum(a_i,b_i,c_i)\mathbf{Z})/((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+(a_0,b_0,c_0)\mathbf{Z})\right)$$

if q^* is a 3-point.

We compute the Jacobian

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\frac{\partial(u,v,w)}{\partial(\hat x,\hat y,\hat z)}\right)=\mathrm{Det}\begin{pmatrix} a & b & c\\ d & e & f\\ g & h & i\end{pmatrix}\hat x^{a+d+g-1}\hat y^{b+e+h-1}\hat z^{c+f+i-1}. \tag{51}$$

Let $\overline{e}$ be a common denominator of the $\overline{a}_{ij}$. There exists an affine neighborhood $U=\mathrm{spec}(A)$ of p^* such that $\tilde x,\tilde y,\tilde z$ are uniformizing parameters on U, and γ_1,γ_2 are units on U. Let

$$B=A[\gamma_1^{\frac{1}{\overline{e}}},\gamma_2^{\frac{1}{\overline{e}}}],$$

$V=\mathrm{spec}(B)$. After possibly shrinking U to a smaller neighorhood of p^*, we may assume that V is an etale cover of U and x,y,z are uniformizing parameters on V. Let $\Lambda:V\to U$ be the natural morphism.

Suppose that $p\in D_X\cap U$ is a 2-point. We will show that $\tau_f(\Lambda(p))\le\tau_f(p^*)$. After possibly interchanging x,y,z, we may assume that $\mathcal{O}_{V,p}$ has regular parameters $x,y,\tilde z=z-\alpha$ for some $0\ne\alpha\in\mathbf{k}$. After interchanging u,v if necessary, we have three possible cases:

1. $ae-bd\ne 0$,
2. $ae-bd\ne 0$, $(d,e)\ne(0,0)$,
3. $(d,e)=0$.

We will analyze these three cases in turn.

Suppose that $ae-bd\ne 0$, Define (formal) regular parameters $\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{z}$ at p by choosing $\lambda_1,\lambda_2\in\mathbf{Q}$ so that

$$x=\overline{x}z^{\lambda_1},y=\overline{y}z^{\lambda_2},z=\overline{z}+\alpha$$

satisfy

$$u=\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b,v=\overline{x}^d\overline{y}^e.$$

We thus have an expression

$$u=\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b,v=\overline{x}^d\overline{y}^e,w=P(\overline{x},\overline{y})+\overline{x}^m\overline{y}^n\Omega \tag{52}$$

for some series $P(\overline{x},\overline{y})$ and $\Omega\in\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$, where $\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial\overline{z}}(0,0,0)\ne 0$.

We compute the Jacobian determinant

$$\mathrm{Det}\begin{pmatrix} \partial(u,v,w) \\ \partial(\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{z}) \end{pmatrix} = (ae-bd)\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial\overline{z}}\overline{x}^{a+d+m-1}\overline{y}^{b+e+n-1}$$

so that $\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial\overline{z}}(0,0,0)\neq 0$. Comparing with (51), we see that $m=g$ and $n=h$.

We compute that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{x}} = z^{\lambda_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{y}} = z^{\lambda_2}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{z}} = \lambda_1\frac{x}{z}\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \lambda_2\frac{y}{z}\frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z}.$$

Thus

$$\frac{\partial^{m+n}w}{\partial\overline{x}^m\partial\overline{y}^n} = z^{m\lambda_1+n\lambda_2}\frac{\partial^{m+n}w}{\partial x^m\partial y^n}.$$

From (50) we see that $\frac{\partial^{m+n}w}{\partial x^m\partial y^n}\in(x,y)$ if $(m,n)\neq(a_i,b_i)$ for any i, and $(m,n)\not\geq(g,h)$. We have an expansion

$$P(\overline{x},\overline{y}) = \sum_{(m,n)\not\geq(g,h)}\frac{1}{m!n!}\frac{\partial^{m+n}w}{\partial\overline{x}^m\partial\overline{y}^n}(p)\overline{x}^m\overline{y}^n.$$

Thus there is an expansion

$$P = \sum\beta_i\overline{x}^{a_i}\overline{y}^{b_i}$$

with

$$\beta_i = \alpha^{m\lambda_1+n\lambda_2}\frac{\partial^{m+n}w}{\partial x^m\partial y^n}(p).$$

We conclude that we may make a formal change of variables in (52), setting $\beta = \Omega(0,0,0)$ and $z^* = \Omega-\beta$, to get

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = \overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b \\ v & = \overline{x}^d\overline{y}^e \\ w & = \sum\beta_i\overline{x}^{a_i}\overline{y}^{b_i} + \overline{x}^g\overline{y}^h(z^*+\beta). \end{array} \tag{53}$$

We now compare $\tau_f(p)$ to $\tau_f(p^*)$. Let $q=f(p)$.

Suppose that q^* is a 3-point. If q is a 2-point, then either $(a_0,b_0)=(0,0)$, or $g=h=0$ in (53). $(a_0,b_0)=(0,0)$ implies $ae-bd=0$ which is not possible. Thus $g=h=0$, and we see that $\tau_f(p)=-\infty\leq\tau_f(p^*)$. Suppose that q is a 3-point. Then we compute $\tau_f(p)$ from (53) and (21), to get

$$\begin{array}{ll} \tau_f(p) & = \ell\Big(((a,b)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e)\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{\beta_i\neq 0,(a_i,b_i)\not\geq(g,h)}(a_i,b_i)\mathbf{Z})/((a,b)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e)\mathbf{Z}+(a_0,b_0)\mathbf{Z})\Big) \\ & \leq \tau_f(p^*). \end{array}$$

Suppose that q^* is a 2-point. Then q is a 2-point, and we have from (53) and (21) that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \tau_f(p) & = \ell\Big(((a,b)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e)\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{\beta_i\neq 0,(a_i,b_i)\not\geq(g,h)}(a_i,b_i)\mathbf{Z})/((a,b)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e)\mathbf{Z})\Big) \\ & \leq \tau_f(p^*). \end{array}$$

Suppose that $ae-bd\neq 0$ and $(d,e)\neq(0,0)$.

There exist $\overline{a},\overline{b},t,k$ such that $(a,b)=k(\overline{a},\overline{b})$, $(d,e)=t(\overline{a},\overline{b})$ with $\gcd(\overline{a},\overline{b})=1$, $k,t\neq 0$.

Define (formal) regular parameters $\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{z}$ at p by choosing $\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3\in\mathbf{Q}$ so that

$$x=\overline{x}z^{\lambda_1}, y=\overline{y}z^{\lambda_2}, z^{\lambda_3}=\overline{z}+\overline{\alpha}$$

satisfy

$$u=(\overline{x}^{\overline{a}}\overline{y}^{\overline{b}})^k, v=(\overline{x}^{\overline{a}}\overline{y}^{\overline{b}})^t(\overline{z}+\overline{\alpha}).$$

We thus have an expression

$$u=(\overline{x}^{\overline{a}}\overline{y}^{\overline{b}})^k, v=(\overline{x}^{\overline{a}}\overline{y}^{\overline{b}})^t(\overline{z}+\overline{\alpha}), w=P(\overline{x}^{\overline{a}}\overline{y}^{\overline{b}},\overline{z})+\overline{x}^m\overline{y}^n\Omega \tag{54}$$

where Ω is a unit series and $\overline{a}n-\overline{b}m\neq 0$.

We compute the Jacobian determinant

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\begin{array}{c}\partial(u,v,w)\\ \partial(\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{z})\end{array}\right)=(\overline{x}^{\overline{a}}\overline{y}^{\overline{b}})^{t+k-1}\overline{x}^{m+\overline{a}-1}\overline{y}^{n+\overline{b}-1}\gamma,$$

where

$$\gamma=k(\overline{b}m-\overline{a}n)\Omega+k\overline{b}\overline{x}\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial\overline{x}}-k\overline{a}\overline{y}\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial\overline{y}}$$

is a unit series. Comparing with (51), we see that $m=g$ and $n=h$.

We compute that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{x}}=z^{\lambda_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x},\frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{y}}=z^{\lambda_2}\frac{\partial}{\partial y},\frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{z}}=\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_3}xz^{-\lambda_3}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}+\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_3}yz^{-\lambda_3}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}+\frac{1}{\lambda_3}z^{1-\lambda_3}\frac{\partial}{\partial z}.$$

Thus

$$\frac{\partial^{m+n}w}{\partial\overline{x}^m\partial\overline{y}^n}=z^{m\lambda_1+n\lambda_2}\frac{\partial^{m+n}w}{\partial x^m\partial y^n}.$$

From (50) we see that $\frac{\partial^{m+n}w}{\partial x^m\partial y^n}\in(x,y)$ if $(m,n)\neq(a_i,b_i)$ for any i, and $(m,n)\not\geq(g,h)$. There is thus an expansion

$$P(\overline{x}^{\overline{a}}\overline{y}^{\overline{b}},z)=\sum_{j,k}\beta_{j,k}(\overline{x}^{\overline{a}}\overline{y}^{\overline{b}})^j\overline{z}^k$$

with

$$\beta_{j,k}=\frac{1}{k!(j\overline{a})!(j\overline{b})!}\frac{\partial^k}{\partial\overline{z}^k}\left(\frac{\partial^{j(\overline{a}+\overline{b})}w}{\partial\overline{x}^{j\overline{a}}\partial\overline{y}^{j\overline{b}}}\right)(p).$$

Thus $\beta_{j,k}=0$ if $(j\overline{a},j\overline{b})\neq(a_i,b_i)$ for some i, and $(j\overline{a},j\overline{b})\not\geq(g,h)$.

We conclude that we may make a formal change of variables in (54), setting

$$\overline{x}=x^*\gamma_1 \text{ and } \overline{y}=y^*\gamma_2,$$

with appropriate unit series γ_1 and γ_2, to get

$$\begin{array}{ll} u&=((x^*)^{\overline{a}}(y^*)^{\overline{b}})^k\\ v&=(x^*)^{\overline{a}}(y^*)^{\overline{b}})^t(\overline{z}+\overline{\alpha})\\ w&=P((x^*)^{\overline{a}}(y^*)^{\overline{b}},\overline{z})+(x^*)^g(y^*)^h.\end{array}\tag{55}$$

We now compare $\tau_f(p)$ to $\tau_f(p^*)$. Let $q=f(p)$.

Suppose that q^* is a 3-point. Suppose that q is a 3-point. We compute $\tau_f(p)$ from (55) and (22), to get

$$\tau_f(p)=\ell\left((k\mathbf{Z}+t\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{\beta_{j,k}\neq 0,(j\overline{a},j\overline{b})\not\geq(g,h)}j\mathbf{Z})/(k\mathbf{Z}+t\mathbf{Z}+j_0\mathbf{Z})\right),$$

where $j_0(\overline{a},\overline{b})=(a_0,b_0)$. We have a surjection

$$\begin{array}{l}((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+\sum(a_i,b_i,c_i)\mathbf{Z})/((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+(a_0,b_0,c_0)\mathbf{Z})\\ \rightarrow(k\mathbf{Z}+t\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{j(\overline{a},\overline{b})=(a_i,b_i)}j\mathbf{Z})/(k\mathbf{Z}+t\mathbf{Z}+j_0\mathbf{Z})\end{array}$$

defined by $j(\overline{a},\overline{b},0)+l(0,0,1)\mapsto j$. Thus $\tau_f(p)\leq\tau_f(p^*)$.

If q is a 2-point, then we must have that $(a_0, b_0) = (0,0)$ or $g = h = 0$. But we cannot have $g = h = 0$ since

$$\mathrm{Det}\begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ d & e & f \\ g & h & i \end{pmatrix} \neq 0.$$

If $(a_0, b_0) = (0,0)$, then we have $(a_0, b_0, c_0) = (0, 0, c_0)$, from which we conclude that $\tau_f(p) \le \tau_f(p^*)$.

Suppose that q^* is a 2-point. Then q is a 2-point.

We compute $\tau_f(p)$ from (55) and (22), to get

$$\tau_f(p) = \ell\left((k\mathbf{Z} + t\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{\beta_{j,k}\neq 0, (j\overline{a}, j\overline{b})\not\geq (g,h)} j\mathbf{Z})/(k\mathbf{Z}+t\mathbf{Z})\right).$$

As in the case when q^* is a 3-point, we conclude that $\tau_f(p) \le \tau_f(p^*)$.

Suppose that $d = e = 0$**.** We have $(a,b) = k(\overline{a}, \overline{b})$ with $\overline{a}, \overline{b} > 0$ and $\gcd(\overline{a}, \overline{b}) = 1$.

Define regular parameters $\overline{x}, \overline{y}, \overline{z}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ by choosing $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbf{Q}$ and $\overline{\alpha} = \alpha^f$, so that

$$x = \overline{x}z^{\lambda_1}, y = \overline{y}z^{\lambda_2}, z^f = \overline{z} + \overline{\alpha}$$

satisfy

$$u = (\overline{x}^{\overline{a}}\overline{y}^{\overline{b}})^k, v = \overline{z} + \overline{\alpha}.$$

We thus have an expression

$$u = (\overline{x}^{\overline{a}}\overline{y}^{\overline{b}})^k, \overline{v} = v - \overline{\alpha} = \overline{z}, w = P(\overline{x}^{\overline{a}}\overline{y}^{\overline{b}}, \overline{z}) + \overline{x}^m\overline{y}^n\Omega \tag{56}$$

where $u, \overline{v}$ are toroidal forms at $q = f(p)$, P is a series, Ω is a unit series and $\overline{a}n - \overline{b}m \neq 0$.

We compute the Jacobian

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\frac{\partial(u,v,w)}{\partial(\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{z})}\right) = \overline{x}^{a+m-1}\overline{y}^{b+n-1}\gamma.$$

where

$$\gamma = (mb - an)\Omega + b\overline{x}\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial\overline{x}} - a\overline{y}\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial\overline{y}}$$

is a unit series. Comparing with (51), we see that $m = g$ and $n = h$.

We compute that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{x}} = z^{\lambda_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{y}} = z^{\lambda_2}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{z}} = \frac{\lambda_1}{f}\frac{x}{z^f}\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{\lambda_2}{f}\frac{y}{z^f}\frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \frac{1}{f}z^{1-f}\frac{\partial}{\partial z}.$$

Thus

$$\frac{\partial^{m+n}w}{\partial\overline{x}^m\partial\overline{y}^n} = z^{m\lambda_1 + n\lambda_2}\frac{\partial^{m+n}w}{\partial x^m\partial y^n}.$$

From (50) we see that $\frac{\partial^{m+n}w}{\partial x^m\partial y^n} \in (x,y)$ if $(m,n) \neq (a_i, b_i)$ and $(m,n) \not\geq (g,h)$. There is an expansion

$$P = \sum_{j,k}\beta_{j,k}(\overline{x}^{\overline{a}}\overline{y}^{\overline{b}})^j\overline{z}^k$$

with

$$\beta_{j,k} = \frac{1}{k!(j\overline{a})!(j\overline{b})!}\frac{\partial^k}{\partial\overline{z}^k}\left(\frac{\partial^{j(\overline{a}+\overline{b})}w}{\partial\overline{x}^{j\overline{a}}\partial\overline{y}^{j\overline{b}}}\right)(p).$$

Thus $\beta_{j,k} = 0$ if $(j\overline{a}, j\overline{b}) \neq (a_i, b_i)$ and $(j\overline{a}, j\overline{b}) \not\geq (g,h)$.

We conclude that we may make a formal change of variables in (56), setting

$$\overline{x}=x^*\gamma_1 \text{ and } \overline{y}=y^*\gamma_2,$$

with appropriate unit series γ_1 and γ_2, to get

$$\begin{array}{ll} u &= ((x^*)^{\overline{a}}(y^*)^{\overline{b}})^k\\ \overline{v} &= v-\overline{\alpha}=\overline{z}\\ w &= P((x^*)^{\overline{a}}(y^*)^{\overline{b}},\overline{z})+(x^*)^g(y^*)^h. \end{array} \tag{57}$$

We now compare $\tau_f(p)$ to $\tau_f(p^*)$. Let $q=f(p)$.

Suppose that q^* is a 3-point. Then q is a 1-point or a 2-point. If q is a 2-point, then $u,w,\overline{v}$ are permissible parameters at q such that there is an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll} u &= ((x^*)^{\overline{a}}(y^*)^{\overline{b}})^k\\ w &= P((x^*)^{\overline{a}}(y^*)^{\overline{b}},\overline{z})+(x^*)^g(y^*)^h\\ \overline{v} &= \overline{z} \end{array}$$

of the form of 2 (c) of Definition 3.6, and (23).

We have

$$\tau_f(p)=\ell\left((k\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{\beta_{j,k}\neq 0,(j\overline{a},j\overline{b})\not\geq(g,h)} j\mathbf{Z})/(k\mathbf{Z}+j_0\mathbf{Z})\right),$$

where $j_0(\overline{a},\overline{b})=(a_{i_0},b_{i_0})$.

We thus have a surjection

$$\begin{array}{l} ((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+\sum(a_i,b_i,c_i)\mathbf{Z})/((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+(a_0,b_0,c_0)\mathbf{Z})\\ \to (k\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{j(\overline{a},\overline{b})=(a_i,b_i)} j\mathbf{Z})/(k\mathbf{Z}+j_0\mathbf{Z}) \end{array}$$

defined by $j(\overline{a},\overline{b},0)+l(0,0,1)\mapsto j$. Thus $\tau_f(p)\le\tau_f(p^*)$.

If q^* is a 3-point and q is a 1-point, then we have permissible parameters $u,\overline{v},\overline{w}$ at q, defined by

$$\begin{array}{ll} u &= ((x^*)^{\overline{a}}(y^*)^{\overline{b}})^k\\ \overline{v} &= \overline{z}\\ \overline{w} &= w-\beta=P((x^*)^{\overline{a}}(y^*)^{\overline{b}},\overline{z})-\beta+(x^*)^g(y^*)^h \end{array}$$

of the form (7) and (24), where $0\neq\beta=P(0,0)$ so that $(a_{j_0},b_{j_0})=(0,0)$.

We have

$$\tau_f(p)=\ell\left(k\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{\beta_{j,k}\neq 0,(j\overline{a},j\overline{b})\not\geq(g,h)} j\mathbf{Z})/k\mathbf{Z}\right).$$

We have a surjection

$$\begin{array}{l} ((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+\sum(a_i,b_i,c_i)\mathbf{Z})/((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+(a_0,b_0,c_0)\mathbf{Z})\\ \to (k\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{j(\overline{a},\overline{b})=(a_i,b_i)} j\mathbf{Z})/(k\mathbf{Z}+j_0\mathbf{Z}) \end{array}$$

defined by $j(\overline{a},\overline{b},0)+l(0,0,1)\mapsto j$. Thus $\tau_f(p)\le\tau_f(p^*)$.

There is a similar analysis if q^* is a 2-point.

We have completed the analysis for a 2-point $p\in V$.

Now suppose that $p\in D_X\cap V$ is a 1-point. Recall that we are assuming that p^* is a 3-point. We will show that $\tau_f(\Lambda(p))\le\tau_f(p^*)$. After possibly interchanging x,y,z, we may suppose that $\mathcal{O}_{V,p}$ has regular parameters $x,y-\alpha,z-\beta$ for some $0\neq\alpha\in\mathbf{k}$, $0\neq\beta\in\mathbf{k}$. After interchanging u,v and y,z if necessary, we have two possible cases: $a,d\neq 0$, $e\neq 0$ and $a\neq 0$, $d=0$, $e\neq 0$. We will analyze these two cases in turn.

Suppose that $a, d \ne 0$ and $e \ne 0$.

Define regular parameters $\overline{x}, \overline{y}, \overline{z}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ by choosing $\lambda_{ij} \in \mathbf{Q}$, $\overline{\alpha} = \alpha^{\lambda_{21}}\beta^{\lambda_{22}}$, so that

$$x = \overline{x}y^{\lambda_{11}}z^{\lambda_{12}}, \overline{y} + \overline{\alpha} = y^{\lambda_{21}}z^{\lambda_{22}}, \overline{z} + \beta = z$$

satisfy

$$u = \overline{x}^a, v = \overline{x}^d(\overline{y} + \overline{\alpha}).$$

We thus have an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = \overline{x}^a \\ v & = \overline{x}^d(\overline{y} + \overline{\alpha}) \\ w & = P(\overline{x}, \overline{y}) + \overline{x}^m\Omega \end{array} \tag{58}$$

where $\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial\overline{z}}(0,0,0) \ne 0$.

We compute the Jacobian

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\begin{array}{c} \partial(u,v,w) \\ \partial(\overline{x}, \overline{y}, \overline{z}) \end{array}\right) = \overline{x}^{a+d+m-1}\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial\overline{z}}.$$

Comparing with (51), we see that $m = g$.

We have

$$\begin{array}{ll} x & = \overline{x}(\overline{y} + \overline{\alpha})^{\frac{\lambda_{11}}{\lambda_{21}}}(\overline{z} + \beta)^{\lambda_{12} - \frac{\lambda_{11}\lambda_{22}}{\lambda_{21}}} \\ y & = (\overline{y} + \overline{\alpha})^{\frac{1}{\lambda_{21}}}(\overline{z} + \beta)^{-\frac{\lambda_{22}}{\lambda_{21}}} \\ z & = \overline{z} + \beta, \end{array}$$

from which we see that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{x}} & = y^{\lambda_{11}}z^{\lambda_{12}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{y}} & = \frac{\lambda_{11}}{\lambda_{21}}xy^{-\lambda_{21}}z^{-\lambda_{22}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{\lambda_{21}}y^{1-\lambda_{21}}z^{-\lambda_{22}}\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{z}} & = \left(\frac{\lambda_{12}\lambda_{21} - \lambda_{11}\lambda_{22}}{\lambda_{21}}\right)xz^{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \frac{\lambda_{22}}{\lambda_{21}}yz^{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z}. \end{array}$$

Thus

$$\frac{\partial^m w}{\partial\overline{x}^m} = y^{m\lambda_{11}}z^{m\lambda_{12}}\frac{\partial^m w}{\partial x^m}.$$

From (50) we see that $\frac{\partial^m w}{\partial x^m} \in (x)$ if $m \ne a_i$ for some i and $m \not\geq g$. There is an expansion

$$P = \sum_{j,k}\beta_{j,k}\overline{x}^j\overline{y}^k$$

with

$$\beta_{j,k} = \frac{1}{k!j!}\frac{\partial^k}{\partial\overline{y}^k}\left(\frac{\partial^j w}{\partial\overline{x}^j}\right)(0,0,0).$$

Thus $\beta_{j,k} = 0$ if $j \ne a_i$ and $j \not\geq g$.

We may make a formal change of variables in (58), setting $\overline{\beta} = \Omega(0,0,0)$ and $z^* = \Omega - \overline{\beta}$, to get

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = \overline{x}^a \\ v & = \overline{x}^d(\overline{y} + \overline{\alpha}) \\ w & = \sum\beta_{j,k}\overline{x}^j\overline{y}^k + \overline{x}^g(z^* + \overline{\beta}). \end{array} \tag{59}$$

We now compare $\tau_f(p)$ to $\tau_f(p^*)$. Let $q = f(p)$.

Suppose that q^* is a 3-point. If q is a 2-point then we have that $a_0 = 0$, and

$$\tau_f(p) = \ell\left((a\mathbf{Z} + d\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{j<g}j\mathbf{Z})/(a\mathbf{Z} + d\mathbf{Z})\right) \le \tau_f(p^*).$$

If q^* is a 3-point and q is a 3-point, then

$$\tau_f(p)=\ell\left((a\mathbf{Z}+d\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{\beta_{jk}\neq 0, j<g} j\mathbf{Z})/(a\mathbf{Z}+d\mathbf{Z}+a_0\mathbf{Z})\right)\le \tau_f(p^*).$$

Suppose that q^* is a 2-point. Then q is a 2-point, and by a similar calculation, $\tau_f(p)\le\tau_f(p^*)$.

Suppose that $a\neq 0$, $d=0$, $e\neq 0$.

Define (formal) regular parameters $\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{z}$ at p by choosing $\lambda_{1j}\in\mathbf{Q}$ and $\overline{\alpha}=\alpha^e\beta^f$ so that

$$x=\overline{x}y^{\lambda_{11}}z^{\lambda_{12}}, \overline{y}+\overline{\alpha}=y^ez^f, \overline{z}+\beta=z$$

satisfy

$$u=\overline{x}^a, \overline{v}=v-\overline{\alpha}=\overline{y}.$$

We thus have an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & =\overline{x}^a\\ \overline{v} & =v-\overline{\alpha}=\overline{y}\\ w & =P(\overline{x},\overline{y})+\overline{x}^m\Omega \end{array}\tag{60}$$

where $\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial\overline{z}}(0,0,0)\neq 0$.

We compute the Jacobian

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\begin{array}{c}\partial(u,v,w)\\ \partial(\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{z})\end{array}\right)=\overline{x}^{a+m-1}\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial\overline{z}}.$$

Comparing with (51), we see that $m=g$.

We have

$$\begin{array}{ll} x & =\overline{x}(\overline{y}+\overline{\alpha})^{\frac{\lambda_{11}}{e}}(\overline{z}+\beta)^{\lambda_{12}-\frac{\lambda_{11}f}{e}}\\ y & =(\overline{y}+\overline{\alpha})^{\frac{1}{e}}(\overline{z}+\beta)^{-\frac{f}{e}}\\ z & =\overline{z}+\beta, \end{array}$$

from which we see that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{x}} & =y^{\lambda_{11}}z^{\lambda_{12}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{y}} & =\frac{\lambda_{11}}{e}xy^{-e}z^{-f}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}+\frac{1}{e}y^{1-e}z^{-f}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{z}} & =\frac{(\lambda_{12}e-\lambda_{11}f)}{e}xz^{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}-\frac{f}{e}yz^{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}+\frac{\partial}{\partial z}. \end{array}$$

Thus

$$\frac{\partial^m w}{\partial\overline{x}^m}=y^{m\lambda_{11}}z^{m\lambda_{12}}\frac{\partial^m w}{\partial x^m}.$$

From (50) we see that $\frac{\partial^m w}{\partial x^m}\in(x)$ if $m\neq a_i$ for some i and $m\not\geq g$. There is an expansion

$$P=\sum_{j,k}\beta_{j,k}\overline{x}^j\overline{y}^k$$

with

$$\beta_{j,k}=\frac{1}{k!j!}\frac{\partial^k}{\partial\overline{y}^k}\left(\frac{\partial^j w}{\partial\overline{x}^j}\right)(0,0,0).$$

Thus $\beta_{j,k}=0$ if $j\neq a_i$ and $j\not\geq g$.

We may make a formal change of variables in (60), setting $\overline{\beta}=\Omega(0,0,0)$ and $z^*=\Omega-\overline{\beta}$, to get

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & =\overline{x}^a\\ \overline{v} & =\overline{y}\\ w & =\sum\beta_{j,k}\overline{x}^j\overline{y}^k+\overline{x}^g(z^*+\overline{\beta}). \end{array}\tag{61}$$

We now compare $\tau_f(p)$ to $\tau_f(p^*)$. Let $q = f(p)$.

Suppose that q^* is a 3-point. If q is a 1-point then we have that $a_0 = 0$, and $u, \overline{v}, \overline{w} = w - w(q)$ are permissible parameters at q which have a form (6) and (29) at p.

$$\tau_f(p) = \ell\left((a\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{\beta_{jk}\neq 0, j<g} j\mathbf{Z})/a\mathbf{Z}\right) \le \tau_f(p^*).$$

If q is a 2-point, then $u, w, \overline{v}$ are premissible parameters at q which have a form 2 (b) of Definition 3.6 and (28), and

$$\tau_f(p) = \ell\left((a\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{\beta_{jk}\neq 0, j<g} j\mathbf{Z})/(a\mathbf{Z} + a_0\mathbf{Z})\right) \le \tau_f(p^*).$$

Suppose that q^* is a 2-point. Then q is a 1-point, and by a similar calculation, $\tau_f(p) \le \tau_f(p^*)$.

This completes the analysis that $\tau_f(p) \le \tau_f(p^*)$ if p^* is a 3-point and $p \in U$.

The analysis when p^* is a 2-point or a 1-point is simpler, and we leave it to the reader.

We conclude that τ_f is upper semi-continuous.

□

Definition 4.4. *Suppose that* $f : X \to Y$ *is a prepared, proper morphism, and* $\tau \in \mathbf{N}$ *is such that* $\tau_f(X) \le \tau$. *Let* $G_X(f, \tau) = \{p \in X \mid \tau_f(X) = \tau\}$, $G_Y(f,\tau) = f(G_X(f,\tau))$. *We will say that* f *is* τ*-prepared if* $G_Y(f,\tau)$ *contains no 2-curves and no 3-points.*

By Lemma 4.3, $G_X(f, \tau)$ is a closed subset of X, and since f is proper, $G_Y(f,\tau)$ is a closed subset of Y.

5. Super Parameters

Throughout this section, we assume that $f : X \to Y$ is a dominant, proper morphism of nonsingular 3-folds.

Definition 5.1. *Suppose that* $f : X \to Y$ *is prepared, and* $q \in Y$ *is a 2-point. Permissible parameters* u, v, w *at* q *are* **super parameters** *for* f *at* q *if at all* $p \in f^{-1}(q)$, *there exist permissible parameters* x, y, z *for* u, v, w *at* p *such that we have one of the forms:*

1. *p is a 1-point*

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= x^b(\alpha + y) \\ w &= x^c\gamma(x,y) + x^d(z+\beta) \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where γ is a unit series (or zero), $0 \neq \alpha \in \mathbf{k}$ and $\beta \in \mathbf{k}$,

2. *p is a 2-point of the form of (3) of Definition 3.1*

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a y^b \\ v &= x^c y^d \\ w &= x^e y^f \gamma(x,y) + x^g y^h (z+\beta) \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

where $ad - bc \neq 0$, γ is a unit series (or zero), and $\beta \in \mathbf{k}$.

3. *p is a 2-point of the form of (4) of Definition 3.1*
$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = (x^ay^b)^k \\ v & = (x^ay^b)^t(\alpha+z) \\ w & = (x^ay^b)^l\gamma(x^ay^b,z)+x^cy^d \end{array} \tag{64}$$
where $0\ne\alpha\in\mathbf{k}$, $ad-bc\ne 0$ and γ is a unit series (or zero).
4. *p is a 3-point*
$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = x^ay^bz^c \\ v & = x^dy^ez^f \\ w & = x^gy^hz^i\gamma+x^jy^kz^l \end{array} \tag{65}$$
where rank$(u,v,x^jy^kz^l)=3$, rank$(u,v,x^gy^hz^i)=2$ and γ is a unit series in monomials M such that rank$(u,v,M)=2$ (or γ is zero).

Suppose that $q\in Y$ is a 1-point. Permissible parameters u,v,w at q are **super parameters** *for f at q if at all $p\in f^{-1}(q)$, there exist permissible parameters x,y,z for u,v,w at p such that we have one of the forms:*

5. *p is a 1-point*
$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = x^a \\ v & = y \\ w & = x^c\gamma(x,y)+x^d(z+\beta) \end{array} \tag{66}$$
where γ is a unit series (or zero) and $\beta\in\mathbf{k}$,
6. *p is a 2-point*
$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = (x^ay^b)^k \\ v & = z \\ w & = (x^ay^b)^l\gamma(x^ay^b,z)+x^cy^d \end{array} \tag{67}$$
where $ad-bc\ne 0$ and γ is a unit series (or zero).

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose that $f:X\to Y$ is prepared, and $\Phi:X_1\to X$ is the blow up of a 2-curve or a 3-point. Let $f_1=f\circ\Phi:X_1\to Y$. Then f_1 is prepared, and $\tau_{f_1}(p)\le\tau_f(\Phi(p))$ for all $p\in D_{X_1}$.*

If $q\in Y$ and u,v,w are super parameters for f at q, then u,v,w are super parameters for f_1 at q.

Proof. We prove this in the case when $\Phi:X_1\to X$ is the blow up of a 2-curve C. The case when Φ is the blow up of a 3-point is similar.

Suppose that $p\in C$. Let $q=f(p)$. Then there are permissible parameters u,v,w at q and x,y,z for u,v,w at p such that either u,v are toroidal forms at p, or a form 2 (c) of Definition 3.6 holds at q. Further, $x=y=0$ are local equations of C at p.

The most difficult case is when p is a 3-point, $q=f(p)$ is a 3-point and $\tau_f(p)\ge 0$. The other cases are similar. Assume that this case holds.

We have an expansion of the form of (19)
$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = x^ay^bz^c \\ v & = x^dy^ez^f \\ w & = \sum_{(a_i,b_i,c_i)\not\ge(g,h,i)}\alpha_ix^{a_i}y^{b_i}z^{c_i}+x^gy^hz^i \end{array} \tag{68}$$
with $\alpha_i\ne 0$ for all i. There are $\phi_i,\psi_i\in\mathbf{Q}$ such that
$$(a_i,b_i,c_i)=\phi_i(a,b,c)+\psi_i(d,e,f)$$
for all i.

Suppose that $p_1 \in \Phi^{-1}(p)$. Then (after possibly interchanging x and y) $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_1,p_1}$ has regular parameters x_1, y_1, z where

$$x = x_1, y = x_1(y_1 + \alpha)$$

for some $\alpha \in \mathbf{k}$. We have

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = x_1^{a+b}(y_1+\alpha)^b z^c \\ v & = x_1^{d+e}(y_1+\alpha)^e z^f \\ w & = \sum_{(a_i,b_i,c_i)\not\geq(g,h,i)} \alpha_i x_1^{a_i+b_i}(y_1+\alpha)^{b_i} z^{c_i} + x_1^{g+h}(y_1+\alpha)^h z^i. \end{array}$$

We may assume that $\tau_{f_1}(p_1) \geq 0$.

Case 1. Assume that $0 \neq \alpha$ **and** $(a+b)f - c(d+e) \neq 0$**.** There exist regular parameters $\overline{x}_1, \overline{y}_1, \overline{z}_1$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_1,p_1}$ and $\overline{\beta} \in \mathbf{k}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = \overline{x}_1^{a+b}\overline{z}_1^{c} \\ v & = \overline{x}_1^{d+e}\overline{z}_1^{f} \\ w & = \sum_{(a_i+b_i,c_i)\not\geq(g+h,i)} \alpha_i \overline{x}_1^{a_i+b_i}\overline{z}_1^{c_i} + \overline{x}_1^{g+h}\overline{z}_1^{i}(\overline{y}_1+\overline{\beta}) \end{array}$$

of the form of (21). The homomorphism $\Lambda : \mathbf{Z}^3 \to \mathbf{Z}^2$ defined by $(x,y,z) \mapsto (x+y,z)$ induces a surjection

$$\begin{array}{l} ((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z} + (d,e,f)\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{i\geq 0}(a_i,b_i,c_i)\mathbf{Z})/((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z} + (d,e,f)\mathbf{Z} + (a_0,b_0,c_0)\mathbf{Z}) \\ \to ((a+b,c)\mathbf{Z} + (d+e,f)\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{i\geq 0}(a_i+b_i,c_i)\mathbf{Z})/((a+b,c)\mathbf{Z} + (d+e,f)\mathbf{Z} + (a_0+b_0,c_0)\mathbf{Z}). \end{array}$$

Thus

$$\begin{array}{ll} \tau_f(p) & \geq \ell(((a+b,c)\mathbf{Z} + (d+e,f)\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{i\geq 0}(a_i+b_i,c_i)\mathbf{Z}) \\ & \quad /((a+b,c)\mathbf{Z} + (d+e,f)\mathbf{Z} + (a_0+b_0,c_0)\mathbf{Z})) \\ & \geq \ell(((a+b,c)\mathbf{Z} + (d+e,f)\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{(a_i+b_i,c_i)\not\geq(g+h,i)}(a_i+b_i,c_i)\mathbf{Z}) \\ & \quad /((a+b,c)\mathbf{Z} + (d+e,f)\mathbf{Z} + (a_0+b_0,c_0)\mathbf{Z})) \\ & = \tau_{f_1}(p_1). \end{array}$$

Case 2. Assume $0 \neq \alpha$**, and** $(a+b)f - c(d=e) = 0$**.** Then there exist $\overline{a}, \overline{b} \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $(a+b,c) = k(\overline{a},\overline{b})$, $(d+e,f) = t(\overline{a},\overline{b})$ with $k, t \neq 0$, $\gcd(\overline{a},\overline{b}) = 1$.

There exist regular parameters $\overline{x}_1, \overline{y}_1, \overline{z}_1$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_1,p_1}$ and $0 \neq \overline{\alpha} \in \mathbf{k}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = \overline{x}_1^{a+b}\overline{z}_1^{c} = (\overline{x}_1^{\overline{a}}\overline{z}_1^{\overline{b}})^k \\ v & = \overline{x}_1^{d+e}\overline{z}_1^{f}(\overline{y}_1+\overline{\alpha}) = (\overline{x}_1^{\overline{a}}\overline{z}_1^{\overline{b}})^t(\overline{y}_1+\overline{\alpha}) \\ w & = \sum_{(a_i+b_i,c_i)\not\geq(g+h,i)} \alpha_i(\overline{x}_1^{a}\overline{z}_1^{b})^{\phi_i k+\psi_i t}(\overline{y}_1+\overline{\alpha})^{\psi_i} + \overline{x}_1^{g+h}\overline{z}_1^{i} \end{array}$$

of the form of (22). We have

$$\tau_{f_1}(p_1) = \ell\left(k\mathbf{Z} + t\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{(a_i+b_i,c_i)\not\geq(g+h,i)}(\phi_i k + \psi_i t)\mathbf{Z})/(k\mathbf{Z} + t\mathbf{Z} + (\phi_0 k + \psi_0 t)\mathbf{Z})\right).$$

As in the argument of Case 1, we see that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \tau_f(p) & \geq \ell(((a+b,c)\mathbf{Z} + (d+e,f)\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{i\geq 0}(a_i+b_i,c_i)\mathbf{Z}) \\ & \quad /((a+b,c)\mathbf{Z} + (d+e,f)\mathbf{Z} + (a_0+b_0,c_0)\mathbf{Z})) \\ & = \ell((k(\overline{a},\overline{b})\mathbf{Z} + t(\overline{a},\overline{b})\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{i\geq 0}(\phi_i k(\overline{a},\overline{b}) + \psi_i t(\overline{a},\overline{b})\mathbf{Z}) \\ & \quad /(k(\overline{a},\overline{b})\mathbf{Z} + t(\overline{a},\overline{b})\mathbf{Z} + (\phi_0 k(\overline{a},\overline{b}) + \psi_0 t(\overline{a},\overline{b}))\mathbf{Z})) \\ & = \ell((k\mathbf{Z} + t\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{i\geq 0}(\phi_i k + \psi_i t)\mathbf{Z}) \\ & \quad /(k\mathbf{Z} + t\mathbf{Z} + (\phi_0 k + \psi_0 t)\mathbf{Z})) \\ & \geq \tau_{f_1}(p_1). \end{array}$$

Case 3. $0=\alpha$**.** There exist regular parameters $\overline{x}_1,\overline{y}_1,\overline{z}_1$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_1,p_1}$ such that
We have

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & =\overline{x}_1^{a+b}\overline{y}_1^b\overline{z}^c\\ v & =\overline{x}_1^{d+e}\overline{y}_1^e\overline{z}^f\\ w & =\sum_{(a_i+b_i,b_i,c_i)\not\geq(g+h,h,i)}\alpha_i\overline{x}_1^{a_i+b_i}\overline{y}_1^{b_i}\overline{z}^{c_i}+\overline{x}_1^{g+h}\overline{y}_1^h\overline{z}_1^i \end{array}$$

of the form of (19). Thus

$$\begin{array}{ll} \tau_{f_1}(p_1) & =\ell(((a+b,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d+e,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{(a_i+b_i,b_i,c_i)\not\geq(g+h,h,i)}(a_i+b_i,b_i,c_i)\mathbf{Z})\\ & /((a+b,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d+e,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+(a_0+b_0,b_0,c_0)\mathbf{Z}))\\ & \leq\tau_f(p). \end{array}$$

The fact that super parameters for f at $q\in Y$ are super parameters for f_1 at q follows from substitution of local equations for Φ into the forms of Definition 5.1 defining super parameters, and making an appropriate change of variables.

☐

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose that $f:X\rightarrow Y$ is prepared, $q\in Y$ and u,v,w are super parameters at q. Then there exists a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves $\Phi:X_1\rightarrow X$ such that $f_1=f\circ\Phi:X_1\rightarrow Y$ is prepared, $\tau_{f_1}(p)\leq\tau_f(\Phi(p))$ for $p\in D_{X_1}$, u,v,w are super parameters at q for f_1 and if $p\in f_1^{-1}(q)$ with $\tau_{f_1}(p)>0$, then $w=0$ is a divisor supported on D_X at p.*

Proof. The fact that for a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves $\Phi:X_1\rightarrow Y$, $f_1=f\circ\Phi:X_1\rightarrow Y$ is prepared and $\tau_{f_1}(p)\leq\tau_f(\Phi(p))$ for $p\in D_{X_1}$ follows from Lemma 5.2.

The condition that u,v,w are super parameters at q is preserved by blowup of 2-curves above X.

If $p\in f_1^{-1}(q)$ is a 1-point, then 1 or 5 of Definition 5.1 hold, and if $\tau_{f_1}(p)>0$, then $w=0$ is a divisor supported on D_X at p.

We may construct Φ so that if $p\in f_1^{-1}(q)$, then $(x^ey^f,x^gy^h)\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_1,p}$ is principal if 2 of Definition 5.1 holds, $((x^ay^b)^l,x^cy^d)\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ is principal if 3 holds, $(x^gy^hz^i,x^jy^kz^l)\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_1,p}$ is principal if 4 holds, $((x^ay^b)^l,x^cy^d)\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_1,p}$ is principal if 6 holds.

We see that in all these cases that $w=0$ is a divisor supported on D_X at p if $\tau_{f_1}(p)>0$, so that the conclusions of the lemma hold. ☐

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose that $f:X\rightarrow Y$ is prepared and $C\subset Y$ is a 2-curve. Then there exists a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

where $\Psi_1:Y_1\rightarrow Y$ is the blow up of C, $\Phi_1:X_1\rightarrow X$ is a product of blow ups of 2-curves, Φ_1 is an isomorphism above $f^{-1}(Y-C)$ and f_1 is prepared. If $p_1\in X_1$ and $p=\Phi_1(p_1)$, then

$$\tau_{f_1}(p_1)\leq\tau_f(p).$$

If f is τ-prepared then f_1 is τ-prepared.

Proof. Most of this is proven in Lemma 5.2 [C5]. It only remains to check that $\tau_{f_1}(p_1)\leq\tau_f(p)$ when p_1 is a 1 or 2-point.

By Lemma 5.3, we know that $\tau_{f\circ\Phi_1}(p_1)\leq\tau_f(p)$. We verify that $\tau_{f_1}(p_1)\leq\tau_{f\circ\Phi_1}(p_1)$.

This can be seen from consideration of local equations of $f\circ\Phi_1$, Φ_1 and Ψ_1, using Lemma 4.2 and the methods of Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3. ☐

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is prepared and $q \in Y$ is a 2-point. Then there exists a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd} \tag{69}$$

where Φ and Ψ are products of blow ups of 2-curves, such that f_1 is prepared, $\tau_{f_1}(p) \le \tau_f(\Phi(p))$ for $p \in D_{X_1}$, and there exist no points of form 2 (b) or 2 (c) of Definition 3.6 for f_1 above points of $\Psi^{-1}(q)$.

Proof. There exist sequences of blow ups of 2-curves $Y_1 \rightarrow Y$ such that the rational map $X \rightarrow Y_1$ is defined at all points $p \in f^{-1}(q)$ such that f has at p an expression of form 2 (b) or 2 (c) of Definition 3.6, and p maps to 1-point. By Lemma 5.4, by blowing up 2-curves above X, we can construct f_1 which has the desired property. $\square$

Definition 5.6. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is τ-prepared, $p \in D_X$ and $q = f(p)$. Let u, v, w be permissible parameters at q. We say that w is good at p for f if one of the following expressions holds:*

p a 1-point, q a 1-point

$$u = x^a, v = y, w = \sum_{a \nmid i} a_{ij}x^iy^j + x^n(z+\alpha) \tag{70}$$

p a 2-point, q a 1-point

$$u = (x^ay^b)^k, v = z, w = \sum_{k \nmid i} a_{ij}(x^ay^b)^iz^j + x^cy^d \tag{71}$$

p a 1-point, q a 2-point

$$u = x^a, v = x^b(\alpha + y), w = \sum_{d \nmid i} a_{ij}x^iy^j + x^n(z+\alpha) \tag{72}$$

where $d = gcd(a, b)$.

p a 2-point, q a 2-point

$$u = x^ay^b, v = x^cy^d, w = \sum_{(i,j) \not\in \mathbf{Z}(a,b)+\mathbf{Z}(c,d)} a_{ij}x^iy^j + x^ey^fz \tag{73}$$

p a 2-point, q a 2-point

$$u = (x^ay^b)^k, v = (x^ay^b)^t(\alpha + z), w = \sum_{d \nmid i} a_{ij}(x^ay^b)^iz^j + x^cy^d \tag{74}$$

where $d = gcd(k, t)$.

p a 3-point, q a 2-point

$$u = x^ay^bz^c, v = x^dy^ez^f, w = \sum a_{ijk}x^iy^jz^k + x^gy^hz^i \tag{75}$$

where the sum is over i, j, k such that

$$Det \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ d & e & f \\ i & j & k \end{pmatrix} = 0, (i,j,k) \not\in \mathbf{Z}(a,b,c) + \mathbf{Z}(d,e,f).$$

Definition 5.7. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is τ-prepared, $p \in D_X$ and $q = f(p)$ is a 1-point. Let u, v, w be permissible parameters at q. We say that w is weakly good at p for f if one of the following forms hold:*

1. *p is a 1-point,*
$$u = x^a, v = y, w = \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_{\sigma_j}(y)x^{\sigma_j} + x^n(z+\alpha)$$
where $\alpha \in \mathbf{k}$, $\sigma_0 < \sigma_1 < \cdots < \sigma_m < n$, σ_i are all nonzero, and $a \not| \sigma_0$.
2. *p is a 2-point,*
$$u = (x^a y^b)^k, v = z, w = \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_{\sigma_j}(z)(x^a y^b)^{\sigma_j} + x^c y^d$$
where $gcd(a,b) = 1$, $ad - bc \neq 0$, $\sigma_m(a,b) \not\geq (c,d)$, $\sigma_0 < \sigma_1 < \cdots < \sigma_m < n$, σ_i are all nonzero, and $k \not| \sigma_0$.

Remark 5.8. *Suppose that $f; X \rightarrow Y$ is τ-prepared and $\tau_f(p) = 0$, u, v, w are permissible parameters at $q = f(p)$, and w is good (weakly good) at p for f. Then u, v, w are monomial forms (Definition 3.4) at p.*

Remark 5.9. *Suppose that $f; X \rightarrow Y$ is τ-prepared. Observe that if q is a 1-point, and u, v, w are permissible parameters at q satisfying the conclusions of Lemma 3.7, then for all $p \in f^{-1}(q)$, there exists a series $\phi_p(u,v)$ such that $w - \phi_p(u,v)$ is good (weakly good) at p for f.*

Lemma 5.10. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is prepared, $q \in Y$ and $u, v, w \in \mathcal{O}_{Y,q}$ are permissible parameters at q. Suppose that $p \in f^{-1}(q)$ and there exists $\phi(u,v) \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y,q}$ such that $w - \phi(u,v)$ is good (weakly good) at p for f.*

Suppose that p is an n-point. Then there exists an affine neighborhood $V = Spec(S)$ of p such that $w - \phi(u,v)$ is good (weakly good) at p' for f for all n-points $p' \in f^{-1}(q) \cap V$.

Proof. We will prove this in the case that p and q are 1-points, and a form (70) of Definition 5.6 holds for $u, v, w - \phi$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$. The proof in the other cases is similar.

There exists an affine neighborhood $V = \text{spec}(S)$ of p, regular parameters $x, y, z \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ and a finite etale morphism $\pi : V_1 = \text{spec}(S_1) \rightarrow S$ such that x, y, z are uniformizing parameters on V_1, and regular parameters in $\mathcal{O}_{V_1,p'}$ for $p' \in \pi^{-1}(p)$ such that
$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= y \\ w &= \textstyle\sum_{i<n} a_{ij}x^i y^j + x^n(\gamma(x,y,z)z + \Omega(x,y)) \end{aligned}$$
in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{V_1,p'} = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ where γ is a unit series, $\Omega(x,y)$ is a series.

Let $U = \text{Spec}(R)$ be an affine neighborhood of q such that $f(V) \subset U$.

In $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$,
$$w - \phi(u,v) = \sum_{a \not| i, i<n} a_{ij}x^i y^j + x^n(\gamma z + \tilde{\Omega})$$
where $\tilde{\Omega}(x,y)$ is a series. We see that
$$x^n \text{ divides } \frac{\partial(w-\phi)}{\partial z} \text{ in } \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p},$$
so that
$$x^n \text{ divides } \frac{\partial(w-\phi)}{\partial z} \text{ in } \mathcal{O}_{X,p} \otimes_{R_q} \hat{R}_q$$
and thus
$$x^n \text{ divides } \frac{\partial(w-\phi)}{\partial z} \text{ in } \mathcal{O}_{S_1,p'} \otimes_{R_q} \hat{R}_q$$
at all points $p' \in \pi^{-1}(p)$.

We also have that

$$\frac{\partial^{n+1}(w-\phi)}{\partial z\partial x^n}(p)\neq 0$$

which implies

$$\frac{\partial^{n+1}(w-\phi)}{\partial z\partial x^n}(p')\neq 0$$

at all $p'\in\pi^{-1}(p)$.

Finally, we see that

$$x \text{ divides } \frac{\partial^i(w-\phi)}{\partial x^i}$$

in $\mathcal{O}_{X,p}\otimes_{R_q}\hat R_q$ if a divides i and $i<n$, and thus

$$x \text{ divides } \frac{\partial^i(w-\phi)}{\partial x^i}$$

in $\mathcal{O}_{S_1,p'}\otimes_{R_q}\hat R_q$ at all points p' of $\pi^{-1}(p)$.

Thus there exists a Zariski closed subset C of V_1 which is disjoint from $\pi^{-1}(p)$ such that if $\overline{p}\in(f\circ\pi)^{-1}(q)\cap(V_1-C)$, then

$$x^n \text{ divides } \frac{\partial(w-\phi)}{\partial z} \text{ in } \mathcal{O}_{S_1,\overline{p}}\otimes_{R_q}\hat R_q \tag{76}$$

$$\frac{\partial^{n+1}(w-\phi)}{\partial z\partial x^n} \text{ is a unit in } \mathcal{O}_{S_1,\overline{p}}\otimes_{R_q}\hat R_q \tag{77}$$

and

$$x \text{ divides } \frac{\partial^i(w-\phi)}{\partial x^i} \text{ in } \mathcal{O}_{S_1,\overline{p}}\otimes_{R_q}\hat R_q \tag{78}$$

if $i<n$ and a divides i.

Let $\overline{C}=\pi(C)$. $\pi:\text{Spec}(S_1)-\pi^{-1}(\overline{C})\rightarrow V-\overline{C}$ is finite etale. Let $\overline{V}=\text{spec}(\overline{S})$ be an affine neighborhood of p in $V-\overline{C}$, and let $\pi^{-1}(\overline{V})=\text{Spec}(\overline{S}_1)$. After replacing V with $\overline{V}$, S with $\overline{S}$, V_1 with $\pi^{-1}(\overline{V})$ and S_1 with $\overline{S}_1$, we have that (76), (77) and (78) hold at all $\overline{p}\in(f\circ\pi)^{-1}(q)$.

Now consider the expression of $u,v,w-\phi(u,v)$ at $\overline{p}\in(f\circ\pi)^{-1})(q)$. There exists $\alpha\in\mathbf{k}$ such that $x,y,z-\alpha$ are regular parameters at $\overline{p}$. We have

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & =x^a\\ v & =y\\ w-\phi & =\sum\frac{1}{i!j!k!}\frac{\partial^{i+j+k}(w-\phi)}{\partial x^i\partial y^j\partial z^k}(0,0,\alpha)x^iy^j(z-\alpha)^k.\end{array}$$

(76) implies

$$\frac{\partial^{i+j+k}(w-\phi)}{\partial x^i\partial y^j\partial z^k}(0,0,\alpha)=0$$

if $i<n$ and $k\geq 1$, (78) implies

$$\frac{\partial^{i+j}(w-\phi)}{\partial x^i\partial y^j}(0,0,\alpha)=0$$

if a divides i and $i<n$, and (77) implies

$$\frac{\partial^{n+1}(w-\phi)}{\partial x^n\partial z}(0,0,\alpha)\neq 0.$$

Thus

$$w-\phi=\sum_{i<n,a\nmid i}\frac{1}{i!j!}\frac{\partial^{i+j}(w-\phi)}{\partial x^i\partial y^j}(0,0,\alpha)x^iy^j+x^n(\gamma'(z-\alpha)+\Omega'(x,y))$$

where $\beta \in \mathbf{k}$ and γ' is a unit series, so that $w - \phi$ is good at $\overline{p}$. $\square$

Lemma 5.11. *Suppose that* $f : X \to Y$ *is prepared, and* $C \subset Y$ *is an irreducible curve in the fundamental locus of* f *such that* C *contains a 1-point.*

Suppose that $U \subset Y$ *is an affine open subset, with uniformizing parameters* u, v, w *such that* u, v, w *are regular parameters in* $\mathcal{O}_{Y,q}$ *for a 1-point* $q \in C \cap U$ *such that* $u = w = 0$ *are local equations of* C*. Then for a general point* $\overline{q}$ *of* $C \cap U$*, and appropriate* $\alpha \in \mathbf{k}$*,* $u, \overline{v} = v - \alpha, w$ *are permissible parameters at* $\overline{q}$ *and for* $p \in f^{-1}(\overline{q})$*, either* p *is a 1-point and we have a form at* p

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a\\ \overline{v} &= y\\ w &= \textstyle\sum_{i<n} \phi_i(y)x^i + x^n(z+\delta) \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

with $\delta \in \mathbf{k}$ *and* $\phi_i(0) \neq 0$ *whenever* $\phi_i \neq 0$*, or* p *is a 2-point with a form at* p

$$\begin{aligned} u &= (x^a y^b)^t\\ \overline{v} &= z\\ w &= \textstyle\sum \phi_i(z)(x^a y^b)^i + x^c y^d \end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

with $ad - bc \neq 0$ *and* $\phi_i(0) \neq 0$ *whenever* $\phi_i \neq 0$*.*

Proof. u, v, w are permissible parameters at the 1-point $q \in C$. Suppose $p \in f^{-1}(q)$. Then there exists a Zariski open neighborhood $V = V^p = \operatorname{Spec}(S)$ of p in X, and an etale neighborhood $W = W^p = \operatorname{Spec}(S_1)$ of V^p with uniformizing parameters x, y, z in S_1, with induced morphism

$$\pi : \operatorname{Spec}(S_1) \to \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbf{k}[x,y,z]),$$

such that x, y, z are regular parameters in $\mathcal{O}_{W^p,p_1}$ for $p_1 \in \pi^{-1}(p)$, and by Lemma 3.7 and its proof, we have one of the following cases:

Case 1. Suppose that p is a 1-point. Then we have in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p} = \hat{S}_p$:

$$u = x^a, v = y, w = \sum_{i<n} \phi_i(y)x^i + x^n(\gamma z + \psi(x,y)) \tag{81}$$

where γ is a unit series. In (81), for $i < n$ we have

$$\frac{1}{i!}\frac{\partial^i w}{\partial x^i} = \phi_i(y) + x\Omega \in \hat{S}_p \tag{82}$$

for some $\Omega \in \hat{S}_p$ and

$$\frac{\partial^{n+1} w}{\partial x^n \partial z}(0,0,0) \neq 0.$$

We can choose V^p so that for $p_1 \in W^p \cap D_X$, with regular parameters

$$x, \overline{y} = y - \alpha, \overline{z} = z - \beta$$

in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{W^p,p_1}$, for $i < n$ we have

$$\frac{\partial^{i+1} w}{\partial z \partial x^i}(0,\alpha,\beta) = 0 \tag{83}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^{n+1} w}{\partial z \partial x^n}(0,\alpha,\beta) \neq 0. \tag{84}$$

We can choose V^p so that for $i < n$, all irreducible components of $x = \frac{\partial^i w}{\partial x^i} = 0$ in W^p contain (a preimage of) p.

Case 2. Suppose that p is a 2-point. Then we have in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p} = \hat{S}_p$:

$$u = (x^ay^b)^t, v = z, w = \sum \phi_i(z)(x^ay^b)^i + x^cy^d\gamma \tag{85}$$

with $\gcd(a,b) = 1$, $ad - bc \neq 0$ and $c > ai$ or $d > bi$ for all i in the series. Further, γ is a unit series.

We have $\Omega_1, \Omega_2 \in \hat{S}_p = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{j!k!}\frac{\partial^{j+k}w}{\partial x^j \partial y^k} = \begin{cases} x\Omega_1 + y\Omega_2 & \text{if } jb - ka \neq 0 \text{ and } j < c \text{ or } k < d \\ \phi_i(z) + x\Omega_1 + y\Omega_2 & \text{if there exists } i \text{ such that } (j,k) = i(a,b) \\ & \text{and } j < c \text{ or } k < d \end{cases} \tag{86}$$

There exists $\Omega_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{j!}\frac{\partial^j w}{\partial x^j} = \begin{cases} x\Omega_1 & \text{if } j < c \text{ and there do not exist } k, i \text{ such that } (j,k) = i(a,b) \\ y^{ib}\phi_i(z) + x\Omega_1 & \text{if } j < c \text{ and there exist } k, i \text{ such that } (j,k) = i(a,b). \end{cases} \tag{87}$$

There exists $\Omega_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{k!}\frac{\partial^k w}{\partial y^k} = \begin{cases} y\Omega_1 & \text{if } k < d \text{ and there do not exist } j, i \text{ such that } (j,k) = i(a,b) \\ x^{ia}\phi_i(z) + y\Omega_1 & \text{if } k < d \text{ and there exist } j, i \text{ such that } (j,k) = i(a,b). \end{cases}$$

Furthermore,

$$\frac{\partial^{c+d}w}{\partial x^c \partial y^d}(0,0,0) \neq 0.$$

We can choose V^p so that

1. for $ai < c$ or $bi < d$, all irreducible components of
$$x = y = \frac{\partial^{i(a+b)}w}{\partial x^{ia}\partial y^{ib}} = 0$$
in W^p contain (a preimage of) p,
2. for $j < c$, all irreducible components of
$$x = \frac{\partial^j w}{\partial x^j} = 0$$
in W^p contain (a preimage of) p, and
3. for $k < d$, all irreducible components of
$$y = \frac{\partial^k w}{\partial y^k} = 0$$
in W^p contain (a preimage of) p.

There exist $V_1 = V^{p_1}, \dots, V_n = V^{p_n}$ such that $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ is an affine cover of $f^{-1}(q)$. We may assume that $V_1, \dots, V_n$ is an affine cover of $f^{-1}(U)$.

Suppose that $\overline{q} \in C \cap U$ is a general point. Then $\mathcal{O}_{Y,q}$ has regular parameters $(u, \overline{v} = v - \alpha, w)$ for a general $\alpha \in \mathbf{k}$. $u, \overline{v}, w$ are permissible parameters at $\overline{q}$. Suppose that $\overline{p} \in f^{-1}(\overline{q})$. $\overline{p} \in V^p = V_i$ for some i. We identify p and $\overline{p}$ with points in $\pi^{-1}(p)$, $\pi^{-1}(\overline{p})$.

Suppose that p is a 1-point. There exists $\beta \in \mathbf{k}$ such that $x, \overline{y} = y - \alpha, z - \beta$ are regular parameters in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,\overline{p}}$. We have an expression

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ \overline{v} &= \overline{y} = y - \alpha \\ w &= \sum \tfrac{1}{i!j!k!}\tfrac{\partial^{i+j+k}w}{\partial x^i \partial y^j \partial z^k}(0,\alpha,\beta)x^i(y-\alpha)^j(z-\beta)^k \end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,\overline{p}}$.

By (83) and (84), in (88), we have

$$w = \sum_{i<n} \overline{\phi}_i(\overline{y})x^i + x^n(\overline{z\gamma} + \overline{\Psi}(x, \overline{y}))$$

where $\overline{\gamma}$ is a unit series, and

$$\overline{\phi}_i(\overline{y}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!j!} \frac{\partial^{i+j} w}{\partial x^i \partial y^j}(0, \alpha, \beta)\overline{y}^j.$$

If $\phi_i(y) = 0$ we have $\overline{\phi}_i(\overline{y}) = 0$.

Suppose that $\phi_i(y) \neq 0$. We will show that $\overline{\phi}_i(0) \neq 0$. If $\phi_i(0) \neq 0$, then $\frac{\partial^i w}{\partial x^i}$ does not vanish on $W^p \cap D_X$, so that

$$\overline{\phi}_i(0) = \frac{\partial^i w}{\partial x^i}(\overline{p}) \neq 0.$$

Suppose that $\phi_i(0) = 0$. Further suppose that

$$\overline{\phi}_i(0) = \frac{\partial^i w}{\partial x^i}(\overline{p}) = 0.$$

Then there exists an irreducible curve Λ which is a component of $x = \frac{\partial^i w}{\partial x^i} = 0$ in W^p containing $\overline{p}$.

By our construction of W^p, we may assume that our choice of preimage of p in W^p satisfies $p \in \Lambda$. Let I_Λ be the prime ideal of Λ in S_1. $\frac{\partial^i w}{\partial x^i}, x \in I_\Lambda(\hat{S_1})_p$ implies $\phi_i(y) \in I_\Lambda(\hat{S_1})_p$. Since $I_\Lambda(\hat{S_1})_p$ is reduced, we have $y \in I_\Lambda(\hat{S_1})_p$. As $(S_1)_p \rightarrow \hat{S_1} = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ is faithfully flat, we have $y \in I_\Lambda(S_1)_p$.

Since I_Λ is a prime ideal and $(I_\Lambda)_p \neq (S_1)_p$, we have that $y \in I_\Lambda$.

The ideal of $\overline{p}$ in $(S_1)_{\overline{p}}$ is $(x, y - \alpha, z - \beta)$.

$$I_\Lambda(S_1)_{\overline{p}} \subset (x, y - \alpha, z - \beta)$$

implies $y \in (x, y - \alpha, z - \beta)$ which is impossible since $0 \neq \alpha$. Thus we have $\overline{\phi}_i(0) \neq 0$.

Suppose that p is a 2-point and $\overline{p}$ is a 2-point. Then there is $\alpha \in \mathbf{k}$ such that $x, y, z - \alpha$ are regular parameters in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,\overline{p}}$, and we have an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = (x^a y^b)^t \\ \overline{v} & = \overline{z} = z - \alpha \\ w & = \sum \frac{1}{i!j!k!} \frac{\partial^{i+j+k} w}{\partial x^i \partial y^j \partial z^k}(0, 0, \alpha) x^i y^j (z - \alpha)^k \end{array} \tag{89}$$

in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,\overline{p}}$.

We have

$$\frac{\partial^{c+d} w}{\partial x^c \partial y^d}(0, 0, \alpha) \neq 0.$$

Further if $j < c$ or $k < d$, $jb - ka \neq 0$ and $l \geq 0$, we have

$$\frac{\partial^{j+k+l} w}{\partial x^j \partial y^k \partial z^l}(0, 0, \alpha) = 0.$$

Thus in (89) we have

$$w = \sum \overline{\phi}_i(z)(x^a y^b)^i + x^c y^d \overline{\gamma}, and$$

where $\overline{\gamma}$ is a unit series, the sum is over i such that $ai < c$ or $bi < d$, and

$$\overline{\phi}_i(\overline{z}) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(ia)!(jb)!k!} \frac{\partial^{ia+jb+k} w}{\partial x^{ia} \partial y^{ib} \partial z^k}(0, 0, \alpha)\overline{z}^k.$$

By a similar analysis as for Case 1, we see that if $\phi_i(z) = 0$ then $\overline{\phi}_i(\overline{z}) = 0$ and if $\phi_i(z) \neq 0$, we have $\overline{\phi}_i(0) \neq 0$.

Suppose that p is a 2-point and $\overline{p}$ is a 1-point. Then after possibly interchanging x and y, there exist $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{k}$ and regular parameters $x, y - \beta, z - \alpha$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,\overline{p}}$ with $0 \neq \alpha, \beta$.

Set

$$\overline{x} = xy^{\frac{b}{a}}, \overline{y} = y - \beta, \overline{z} = z - \alpha$$

Then $\overline{x}, \overline{y}, \overline{z}$ are regular parameters in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,\overline{p}}$. From the Jacobian of $u, \overline{v}, w$ we see that we have an expression

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \overline{x}^{at} \\ \overline{v} &= \overline{z} \\ w &= P(\overline{x}, \overline{z}) + \overline{x}^c \Omega \end{aligned}$$

where P and Ω are series, and P has degree $< c$ in $\overline{x}$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \overline{x}(\overline{y} + \beta)^{-\frac{b}{a}} \\ y &= \overline{y} + \beta \\ z &= \overline{z} + \alpha \end{aligned}$$

Further,

$$\begin{aligned} \tfrac{\partial}{\partial \overline{x}} &= y^{-\frac{b}{a}} \tfrac{\partial}{\partial x} \\ \tfrac{\partial}{\partial \overline{y}} &= -\tfrac{b}{a} x y^{-1} \tfrac{\partial}{\partial x} + \tfrac{\partial}{\partial y} \\ \tfrac{\partial}{\partial \overline{z}} &= \tfrac{\partial}{\partial z}. \end{aligned}$$

We have an expansion

$$P = \sum_{j<c} \overline{\phi}_j(\overline{z}) \overline{x}^j = \sum_{j<c} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\partial^{j+k} w}{\partial \overline{z}^k \partial \overline{x}^j}(\overline{p}) \overline{z}^k \right) \overline{x}^j$$

where

$$\frac{\partial^{j+k} w}{\partial \overline{z}^k \overline{x}^j}(\overline{p}) = \beta^{-j\frac{b}{a}} \frac{\partial^{j+k} w}{\partial z^k \partial x^j}(\overline{p}).$$

By (87) we have that $\overline{\phi}_j(\overline{z}) = 0$ if there do not exist k, i such that $(j, k) = i(a, b)$.

Suppose that $j < c$ and there exists k, i such that $(j, k) = i(a, b)$ and $\phi_j(z) \neq 0$. Suppose that $\overline{\phi}_j(0) = 0$. Then

$$\overline{\phi}_j(0) = 0 = \frac{\partial^j w}{\partial \overline{x}^j}(\overline{p}) = \beta^{-j\frac{b}{a}} \frac{\partial^j w}{\partial x^j}(\overline{p})$$

implies there exists an irreducible curve Λ which is a component of

$$x = \frac{\partial^j w}{\partial x^j} = 0$$

in W^p which contains p and $\overline{p}$. Let I_Λ be the prime ideal of Λ in S_1. $\frac{\partial^j w}{\partial x^j}, x \in I_\Lambda \widehat{(S_1)}_p$ implies

$$y^{ib} \phi_i(z) \in I_\Lambda \widehat{(S_1)_p}.$$

Since $y \notin I_\Lambda \widehat{(S_1)_p}$, as Λ is not a 2-curve, we have $z \in I_\Lambda \widehat{(S_1)}_p$. Thus $z \in I_\Lambda (S_1)_p$. As $(I_\Lambda)_p \neq (S_1)_p$, we have that $z \in I_\Lambda$, which is a contradiction, since $\alpha \neq 0$. Thus $\overline{\phi}_i(0) \neq 0$.

$\square$

Lemma 5.12. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is prepared. Then there exists an open subset V of Y such that $V \cap C \neq \emptyset$ for every integral curve $C \subset D_Y$ contained in the fundamental locus of f which contains a 1-point, and if $U = f^{-1}(V)$, $\overline{f} = f \mid U$, then there exists a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd} U_1 \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_1"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_1"'] & V_1 \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_1"] \\ U \arrow[r, "\overline{f}"] & V \end{tikzcd}$$

such that $\overline{\Phi}_1$ and $\overline{\Psi}_1$ are products of blow ups of curves which dominate a curve C contained in the fundamental locus of $\overline{f}$ which are possible centers (for the preimage of $D_V = D_Y \cap V$) and $\overline{f}_1$ is toroidal.

Proof. By Lemma 5.11, there exists an open set $V \subset Y$ such that $V \cap C = \emptyset$ if C is a 2-curve or an isolated point contained in the fundamental locus of f, $V \cap C \neq \emptyset$ for all curves C contained in the fundamental locus of f which contain a 1-point, and if $\overline{q} \in C \cap V$ is a 1-point, then there exist permissible parameters u, v, w at $\overline{q}$ such that $u = w = 0$ are local equations of C, and if $p_1 \in f^{-1}(q)$, then we have permissible parameters x, y, z in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p_1}$ such that p_1 is a 1-point:

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= y \\ w &= \textstyle\sum_{j=0}^{m} \phi_{i_j}(y) x^{i_j} + x^n(\overline{\alpha} + z) \end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

where $i_m < n$, $\overline{\alpha} \in \mathbf{k}$ and all $\phi_{i_j}(y)$ are nonzero or p_1 is a 2-point:

$$\begin{aligned} u &= (x^a y^b)^t \\ v &= z \\ w &= \textstyle\sum_{j=0}^{m} \phi_{i_j}(z)(x^a y^b)^{i_j} + x^c y^d \end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

where $ad - bc \neq 0$, all $\phi_{i_j}(y)$ are nonzero, and $i_j a < c$ or $i_j b < d$ for all j. We further have that $\phi_{i_j}(0) \neq 0$ for all j.

Let C be the fundamental locus of $\overline{f} : U \rightarrow V$. There exists $\Phi_1' : U_1' \rightarrow U$ which is a product of blow ups of 2-curves (which dominate an irreducible component of C) such that all local forms (91) at points $p \in (\overline{f} \circ \Phi_1')^{-1}(\overline{q})$ for $\overline{q} \in C \cap V$ are such that either $m = -1$ (so that $\sum \phi_{i_j}(z)(x^a y^b)^{i_j} = 0$), or $(x^a y^b)^{i_0}$ divides $x^c y^d$.

Suppose that $\overline{q} \in C$. The set of points $p \in (\overline{f} \circ \Phi_1')^{-1}(\overline{q})$ such that $\mathcal{I}_C \mathcal{O}_{U_1'}$ is not invertible is a union of points p such that p has permissible parameters x, y, z of the form

$$u = x^a, v = y, w = x^n z \tag{92}$$

with $n < a$ or

$$u = (x^a y^b)^t, v = z, w = x^c y^d \tag{93}$$

with $(at - c)(bt - d) < 0$.

Let $\overline{\Psi}_1 : V_1 \rightarrow V$ be the blow up of C (which has local equations $u = w = 0$ at $\overline{q} \in C$).

We can blow up curves above U_1' which dominate a component of C to obtain $\overline{\Phi}_1 : U_1 \rightarrow U_1'$ such that there exists a factorization $\overline{f}_1 : U_1 \rightarrow V_1$, and if $\overline{q} \in C$, $p_1 \in (\overline{f} \circ \Phi_1' \circ \overline{\Phi}_1)^{-1}(\overline{q})$, then an expression (90) or (91) holds.

Suppose that $\overline{q} \in C$, with permissible parameters u, v, w as above. Let $q_1 \in \overline{\Psi}_1^{-1}(\overline{q})$. q_1 has permissible parameters u_1, v_1, w_1 with q_1 a 1-point

$$u = u_1, v = v_1, w = u_1(w_1 + \alpha) \tag{94}$$

or q_1 a 2-point

$$u = u_1v_1, v = w_1, w = u_1. \tag{95}$$

Suppose that $p_1 \in \overline{f}_1^{-1}(q_1)$.

Case 1 Suppose that $0 \neq \alpha$ in (94). Then $a = i_0$ and $\phi_{i_0}(0) = \alpha$ (or $m = -1$, $a = n$ and $\overline{\alpha} = \alpha$) if p_1 satisfies (90), $t = i_0$ and $\phi_{i_0}(0) = \alpha$ if p_1 satisfies (91).

We thus have that at p_1,

$$u_1 = x^a, v = y, w_1 = (\phi_{i_0}(y) - \alpha) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \phi_{i_j}(y)x^{i_j - i_0} + x^{n-i_0}(\overline{\alpha} + z) \tag{96}$$

of the form (90) or

$$u_1 = (x^a y^b)^t, v = z, w_1 = (\phi_{i_0}(z) - \alpha) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \phi_{i_j}(z)(x^a y^b)^{i_j - i_0} + x^{c-i_0a} y^{d-i_0b}. \tag{97}$$

of the form of (91).

If $\overline{f}_1$ is not toroidal at p_1, we have that $u_1 = w_1 - (\phi_{i_0}(v) - \alpha) = 0$ are (formal) local equations of a branch of the fundamental locus of $\overline{f}_1$ through q_1. After possibly replacing V with an open subset of V, for $\overline{q} \in C$, $\overline{q}$ is a general point of a component of C, so the fundamental locus of $\overline{f}_1$ through q_1 must be the germ of a nonsingular algebraic curve.

Case 2 Suppose that $0 = \alpha$ in (94). Then $i_0 > a$ or $m = -1$ and $n > a$ (or $m = -1$, $n = a$ and $\overline{\alpha} = 0$) in (90), or $i_0 > t$ or $m = -1$, $(c, d) > t(a, b)$ in (91). We have that u_1, v, w_1 are permissible parameters at q_1 for $\overline{f}_1$ of the form (90) or (91).

Case 3 (95) holds. Then $a > i_0$ (or $m = -1$, $0 \neq \overline{\alpha}$ and $n < a$) in (90) or $t > i_0$ (or $m = -1$ and $(c, d) \leq (at, bt)$) in (91).

Suppose that (90) holds and $m \geq 0$. We change variables at p_1 to get an expression

$$u = \sum_{i=0}^{\tilde{m}} \tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{i}_j}(y)\tilde{x}^{\tilde{i}_j} + \tilde{x}^{n-i_0+a}(\tilde{z} + \cdots), v = y, w = \tilde{x}^{i_0}$$

with $\tilde{m} < n - i_0 + a$. As in the proof of Lemma 5.11, $\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{i}_j}(0) \neq 0$ for all $\tilde{i}_j$ since $\overline{q}$ is a general point of a component of C.

q_1 is a 2-point, and we have:

$$u_1 = \tilde{x}^{i_0}, v_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{\tilde{m}} \tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{i}_j}(y)\tilde{x}^{\tilde{i}_j - i_0} + \tilde{x}^{n-2i_0+a}(\tilde{z} + \cdots), w_1 = y. \tag{98}$$

Note that $u_1 = v_1 = 0$ are local equations of the fundamental locus of $\overline{f}_1$ at q_1 if $\overline{f}_1$ is not toroidal at p_1.

Suppose that (91) and (95) hold and $m \geq 0$. We change variables at p_1 to have an expression

$$u = \sum_{j=0}^{\tilde{m}} \tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{i}_j}(z)(\tilde{x}^a\tilde{y}^b)^{\tilde{i}_j} + \tilde{x}^{c-i_0a+ta}\tilde{y}^{d-i_0b+tb}, v = z, w = (\tilde{x}^a\tilde{y}^b)^{i_0}$$

with $\tilde{i}_j a < c - i_0a + ta$ or $\tilde{i}_j b < d - i_0b + tb$ for all $\tilde{i}_j$.

As in the proof of Lemma 5.11, $\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{i}_j}(0)\neq 0$ for all $\tilde{i}_j$, since $\overline{q}$ is a general point of a component of C. q_1 is a 2-point and we have

$$u_1=(\tilde{x}^a\tilde{y}^b)^{i_0}, v_1=\sum_{j=0}^{\tilde{m}}\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{i}_j}(z)(\tilde{x}^a\tilde{y}^b)^{\tilde{i}_j-i_0}+\tilde{x}^{c-2i_0a+ta}\tilde{y}^{d-2i_0b+tb}, w_1=z. \tag{99}$$

$u_1=v_1=0$ are local equations of the fundamental locus of $\overline{f}_1$ at q_1 if $\overline{f}_1$ is not toroidal at p_1.

The fundamental locus C_1 of $f_1: U_1\rightarrow V_1$ is a (disjoint) union of nonsingular curves which dominate components of C. If γ_1 is a component of C_1 then γ_1 consists of 1-points or γ_1 consists of 2-points. We will construct a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} U_2 \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_2"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_2"'] & V_2 \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_2"] \\ U_1 \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_1"] & V_1 \end{tikzcd} \tag{100}$$

where $\overline{\Psi}_2: V_2\rightarrow V_1$ is the blow up of C_1.

Suppose that γ_1 is a component of C_1 and $q_1\in\gamma_1$.

First suppose that γ_1 consists of 1-points. Then (90) or (91) holds at all points $p\in\overline{f}_1^{-1}(q_1)$. The construction of (100) above points of γ_1 is as in the construction of $\overline{f}_1$ above.

Suppose that γ_1 consists of 2-points. Then there exist permissible parameters u_1,v_1,w_1 at q_1 such that (98) or (99) holds at all $p\in\overline{f}_1^{-1}(q_1)$, and $u_1=v_1=0$ are local equations of γ_1 at q_1.

If $p\in\overline{f}_1^{-1}(q_1)$ is such that $\mathcal{I}_{C_1}\mathcal{O}_{U_2,p}$ is not invertible, then we have permissible parameters x,y,z at p such that

$$u_1=(x^ay^b)^t, v_1=x^cy^d, w_1=z.$$

In particular, $\overline{f}_1$ is toroidal at p.

We now blow up curves 2-curves (above U_1) which dominate γ_1 and are supported in the locus where $U_1\rightarrow V_1$ is torodial to obtain the construction of $\overline{\Phi}_2: U_2\rightarrow U_1$ above γ_1. $\overline{f}_2$ is toroidal above the torodial locus of f. Let $q_2\in\overline{\Psi}_2^{-1}(q_1)$. q_2 has permissible parameters u_2,v_2,w_2 defined by one of the following 3 cases.

q_2 is a 1-point

$$u_1=u_2, v_1=u_2(w_2+\alpha), w_1=v_2 \tag{101}$$

with $\alpha\neq 0$ or q_2 is a 2-point

$$u_1=u_2, v_1=u_2v_2, w_1=w_2 \tag{102}$$

or q_2 is a 2-point

$$u_1=u_2v_2, v_1=v_2, w_1=w_2. \tag{103}$$

As in the case when q_2 is a 1-point, we see that if (101) holds, then all points above q_2 have the form (90) or (91), and that if (102) or (103) holds, then all points p_2 above q_2 have the form (98) or (99).

We iterate to construct a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\vdots \arrow[d] & \vdots \arrow[d] \\
U_n \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_n"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_n"'] & V_n \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_n"] \\
U_{n-1} \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_{n-1}"] \arrow[d] & V_{n-1} \arrow[d] \\
\vdots \arrow[d] & \vdots \arrow[d] \\
U_1 \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_1"] \arrow[d] & V_1 \arrow[d] \\
U \arrow[r, "\overline{f}"] & V
\end{tikzcd} \tag{104}$$

where each $V_r \rightarrow V_{r-1}$ is the blow up of the fundamental locus C_{r-1} of $\overline{f}_{r-1}$, which is a disjoint union of nonsingular curves which dominate components of C.

All points of U_n have a form (90), (91), (98) or (99). We continue the construction as long as $\overline{f}_n$ is not toroidal.

Suppose that (104) does not converge in a toroidal morphism in a finite number of steps. Then there exists a 0-dimensional valuation ν of $\mathbf{k}(X)$ with center on U such that $\overline{f}_n$ is not toroidal at the center p_n of ν on U_n for all n. Let q_n be the center of ν on V_n.

Suppose that (90) holds for $p = p_0$. There exists $r(1)$ such that $q_{r(1)}$ has permissible parameters $u_{r(1)}, v_{r(1)}, \overline{w}_{r(1)}$ defined by

$$u = u_{r(1)}^{e}, w = u_{r(1)}^{f}(\overline{w}_{r(1)} + \phi_{i_0}(0))$$

where $\gcd(e, f) = 1$ and $\frac{e}{f} = \frac{a}{i_0}$.

The germ of $\overline{f}$ at p factors through $\overline{\Psi}_{r(1)}$, so we have

$$u_{r(1)} = x^{\frac{a}{e}}, \overline{w}_{r(1)} = (\phi_{i_0}(y) - \phi_{i_0}(0)) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \phi_{i_j}(y)x^{i_j - i_0} + x^{n-i_0}(\overline{\alpha} + z).$$

Set $w_{r(1)} = \overline{w}_{r(1)} - [\phi_{i_0}(v) - \phi_{i_0}(0)]$.

$u_{r(1)}, v, w_{r(1)}$ are (formal) regular parameters at $q_{r(1)}$, and $u_{r(1)} = w_{r(1)} = 0$ are equations of the fundamental locus at $q_{r(1)}$. We see that at $p = p_{r(1)}$,

$$u_{r(1)} = x^{a(1)}, v = y, w_{r(1)} = \sum_{j=0}^{m(1)} \phi(1)_{i(1)_j}(y)x^{i(1)_j} + x^{n(1)}(\overline{\alpha} + z)$$

where $a(1) = \gcd(a, i_0)$, $m(1) = m - 1$, $n(1) = n - i_0$, $i(1)_j = i_{j+1} - i_0$ for $0 \le j \le m(1)$, $\phi(1)_{i(1)_j}(y) = \phi_{i_{j+1}}(y)$.

We iterate to get for $k \le m + 1$, $r(k)$ such that $q_{r(k)}$ has permissible parameters $u_{r(k)}, v, \overline{w}_{r(k)}$ defined by

$$u_{r(k-1)} = u_{r(k)}^{e_k}, w_{r(k-1)} = u_{r(k)}^{f_k}(\overline{w}_{r(k)} + \phi(k-1)_{i(k-1)_0}(0))$$

where $\gcd(e_k, f_k) = 1$.

The rational map $U \rightarrow V_{r(k)}$ is a morphism at $p = p_{r(k)}$. Set

$$w_{r(k)} = \overline{w}_{r(k)} - [\phi(k-1)_{i(k-1)_0}(v) - \phi(k-1)_{i(k-1)_0}(0)].$$

We have an expression

$$u_{r(k)} = x^{a(k)}, v = y, w_{r(k)} = \sum_{j=0}^{m(k)} \phi(k)_{i(k)_j}(y) x^{i(k)_j} + x^{n(k)}(\overline{\alpha} + z).$$

We have (for $k \le m+1$) $a(k) = \gcd(a, i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{k-1})$, $n(k) = n - i_{k-1}$, $m(k) = m - k$, $i(k)_j = i_{j+k} - i_{k-1}$ for $0 \le j \le m(k)$.

We further have

$$\frac{e_k}{f_k} = \frac{a(k-1)}{i(k-1)_0} = \frac{\gcd(a, i_0, \dots, i_{k-2})}{i_{k-1} - i_{k-2}}. \tag{105}$$

$u_{r(k)} = w_{r(k)} = 0$ are (formal) equations of the fundamental locus at $q_{r(k)}$.

$q_{r(m+1)}$ has permissible parameters $u_{r(m+1)}, v, w_{r(m+1)}$ defined by

$$u_{r(m+1)} = x^{a(m+1)}, v = y, w_{r(m+1)} = x^{n(m+1)}(\overline{\alpha} + z).$$

The rational map $U \to V_{r(m+1)}$ is a morphism at p. We have

$$a(m+1) = \gcd(a, i_0, i_1, \dots, i_m)$$

and $n(m+1) = n - i_m$.

Finally, we see that there exists $r(m+2)$ such that $\overline{f}_{r(m+2)}$ is toroidal at $p_{r(m+2)}$, a contradiction.

A similar argument holds if (91) holds at $p = p_0$.

We conclude that (104) converges after a finite number of iterations in a diagram which satisfies the conclusions of Lemma 5.12.

□

Definition 5.13. *Suppose that $f : X \to Y$ is τ-prepared and $q \in G_Y(f, \tau)$ is a 1-point. Then q is* **perfect** *for f if the fundamental locus of f through q is a (germ of a) nonsingular curve γ and if u, v, w are algebraic permissible parameters at q such that $u = w = 0$ are local equations of γ at q then there exist finitely many series $\phi_i(u, v) \in \mathbf{k}[[u, v]]$ such that*

1. *$u, v, w_i = w - \phi_i(u, v)$ are super parameters at q for all i.*
2. *For all $p \in f^{-1}(q)$, some w_i is weakly good for f at p.*

Lemma 5.14. *Suppose that $f : X \to Y$ is τ-prepared. Let $V \subset G_Y(f, \tau)$ be the set of perfect 1-points. Then $G_Y(f, \tau) - V$ is a finite set.*

Proof. Suppose that $\overline{q}$ is a general point of a curve $C \subset G_Y(f, \tau)$ (so that $\overline{q}$ is a 1-point). Let u, v, w be algebraic permissible parameters at $\overline{q}$ such that $u = w = 0$ are local equations of C.

In a neighborhood of $\overline{q}$, we construct a diagram (104). (104) is finite by the conclusions of Lemma 5.12.

Suppose that $p \in f^{-1}(\overline{q})$. At p we have permissible parameters $x, y, z \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ such that if p is a 1-point:

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= y \\ w &= \textstyle\sum_{j=0}^m \phi_{i_j}(y) x^{i_j} + x^n(\beta + z) \end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

where $\beta \in \mathbf{k}$, $i_m < n$, all $\phi_{i_j}(y)$ are non zero, or if p is a 2-point:

$$\begin{aligned} u &= (x^b y^c)^a \\ v &= z \\ w &= \textstyle\sum_{j=0}^m \phi_{i_j}(z) (x^b y^c)^{i_j} + x^d y^e \end{aligned} \tag{107}$$

where $\gcd(b,c)=1$, all $\phi_{i_j}(z)$ are non zero, $i_m(b,c)\not\geq(d,e)$. In either case, there exists a largest $l\leq m$ such that $a\mid i_j$ if $j\leq l$.

If at p there is a form (106), set

$$\phi_p(u,v)=\sum_{j\leq l}\phi_{i_j}(y)x^{i_j}=\sum_{j\leq l}\phi_{i_j}(v)u^{\frac{i_j}{a}}.$$

If at p there is a form (107), set

$$\phi_p(u,v)=\sum_{j\leq l}\phi_{i_j}(z)(x^by^c)^{i_j}=\sum_{j\leq l}\phi_{i_j}(v)u^{\frac{i_j}{a}}.$$

In both cases $w-\phi_p(u,v)$ is weakly good for f at p.

By Lemma 5.10, there exist finitely many points $p_1,\dots,p_n\in X$ such that if we set $\phi_i(u,v)=\phi_{p_i}(u,v)$, then for all $p\in f^{-1}(\overline{q})$, some $w_i=w-\phi_i(u,v)$ is weakly good for f at p.

Since the ϕ_{i_j} are units in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p_i}$ by Lemma 5.12, we see that u,v,w_i satisfy 5 or 6 of Definition 5.1 of super parameters at p_i.

Let $p=p_i$ for some i, with the notation of (106) or (107).

Suppose that $\overline{p}\in f^{-1}(\overline{q})$. We must show that u,v,w_i are super parameters at $\overline{p}$.

At $\overline{p}$ we have permissible parameters $\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{z}\in\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,\overline{p}}$ such that if $\overline{p}$ is a 1-point:

$$\begin{aligned}u&=\overline{x}^{\overline{a}}\\ v&=\overline{y}\\ w&=\textstyle\sum_{j=0}^{\overline{m}}\overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_j}(\overline{y})\overline{x}^{\overline{i}_j}+\overline{x}^{\overline{n}}(\overline{\beta}+\overline{z})\end{aligned}\tag{108}$$

where $\overline{\beta}\in\mathbf{k}$, $\overline{i}_{\overline{m}}<\overline{n}$, all $\overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_j}(\overline{y})$ are non zero,

or if $\overline{p}$ a 2-point:

$$\begin{aligned}u&=(\overline{x}^{\overline{b}}\overline{y}^{\overline{c}})^{\overline{a}}\\ v&=\overline{z}\\ w&=\textstyle\sum_{j=0}^{\overline{m}}\overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_j}(\overline{z})(\overline{x}^{\overline{b}}\overline{y}^{\overline{c}})^{\overline{i}_j}+\overline{x}^{\overline{d}}\overline{y}^{\overline{e}}\end{aligned}\tag{109}$$

where $\gcd(\overline{b},\overline{c})=1$, $\overline{i}_{\overline{m}}(\overline{b},\overline{c})\not\geq(\overline{d},\overline{e})$, all $\overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_j}(\overline{z})$ are non zero.

We know from Lemma 5.11 that all ϕ_{i_j} and $\overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_j}$ are units in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,\overline{p}}$ respectively.

It will follow that w_i are super parameters at $\overline{p}$ after we have proven that if there exists t with $t\leq\min\{l,\overline{m}\}$ and

$$\frac{i_j}{a}=\frac{\overline{i}_j}{\overline{a}}\text{ and }\phi_{i_j}(0)=\overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_j}(0)$$

for $0\leq j\leq t$, then we have equality of power series in u,

$$\overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_j}(v)=\phi_{i_j}(v)$$

for $0\leq j\leq t$, and thus equality of series

$$\sum_{j=0}^{t}\phi_{i_j}(v)u^{\frac{i_j}{a}}=\sum_{j=0}^{t}\overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_j}(v)u^{\frac{\overline{i}_j}{\overline{a}}}.$$

We will prove this in the case when $p=p_i$ satisfies (106) and $\overline{p}$ satisfies (108).

The proof of the remaining three cases is similar.

We prove this by induction. First assume that $l\geq 0$ and

$$\frac{i_0}{a}=\frac{\overline{i}_0}{\overline{a}}\tag{110}$$

and $\phi_{i_0}(0)=\overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_0}(0)$.

Let ν be a valuation of $\mathbf{k}(X)$ such that the center of ν on X is p, and identifying ν with an extension of ν to the quotient field of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ which dominates $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$, we have

$$\nu(w-\sum_{j=0}^{k}\phi_{i_j}(y)x^{i_j})>\nu(w-\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\phi_{i_j}(y)x^{i_j})$$

for $0\le k\le m$.

Let p_n be the center of ν on U_n, q_n be the center of ν on V_n in the commutative diagram (104).

With the notation of the proof of Lemma 5.12, we see that the rational map $U\rightarrow V_{r(1)}$ is a morphism at $p=p_{r(1)}$, and $\overline{f}_{r(1)}(p)=q_{r(1)}$ has permissible parameters $u_{r(1)},v,w_{r(1)}$ defined by

$$u=u_{r(1)}^{e},w=u_{r(1)}^{f}(\overline{w}_{r(1)}+\phi_{i_0}(0)),w_{r(1)}=\overline{w}_{r(1)}-[\phi_{i_0}(v)-\phi_{i_0}(0)]\tag{111}$$

with $\gcd(e,f)=1$ and $\frac{e}{f}=\frac{a}{i_0}$.

$$u_{r(1)}=w_{r(1)}=0$$

are local equations of (a branch of) the fundamental locus of $\overline{f}_{r(1)}:U\rightarrow V_{r(1)}$ at $q_{r(1)}$. We see from (111), (108) and (110) that $U\rightarrow V_{r(1)}$ is a morphism at $\overline{p}=\overline{p}_{r(1)}$, that $r(1)=\overline{r}(1)$, and $\overline{f}_{r(1)}(\overline{p})=q_{r(1)}$. Further,

$$u_{r(1)}=\overline{w}_{r(1)}-[\overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_0}(v)-\overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_0}(0)]=0$$

are also (formal) local equations of (a branch of) the fundamental locus of $U_{r(1)}\rightarrow V_{r(1)}$ at $q_{r(1)}$. Since $\overline{q}$ is a general point of C, the fundamental locus of $U_{r(1)}\rightarrow V_{r(1)}$ is a nonsingular curve. Thus

$$\phi_{i_0}(v)=\overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_0}(v).$$

(110) implies that

$$\gcd(a,i_0)=\frac{a}{e}$$

and

$$\gcd(\overline{a},\overline{i}_0)=\frac{\overline{a}}{e}.$$

Suppose that we further have that $l\ge 1$, $\frac{i_1}{a}=\frac{\overline{i}_1}{\overline{a}}$ and $\phi_{i_1}(0)=\overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_1}(0)$. Then from (110) we have

$$\frac{i_1-i_0}{a}=\frac{\overline{i}_1-\overline{i}_0}{\overline{a}}.$$

Thus

$$\frac{\gcd(a,i_0)}{i_1-i_0}=\frac{\gcd(\overline{a},\overline{i}_0)}{\overline{i}_1-\overline{i}_0}.$$

We have (with the notation of (105) of the proof of Lemma 5.12) that

$$\frac{e_2}{f_2}=\frac{\gcd(a,i_0)}{i_1-i_0},$$

the rational map $U\rightarrow X_{r(2)}$ is a morphism at $p=p_{r(2)}$, and $q_{r(2)}=\overline{f}_{r(2)}(p)$ has permissible parameters $u_{r(2)},v,w_{r(2)}$ defined by

$$u_{r(1)}=u_{r(2)}^{e_2},v_{r(1)}=v_{r(2)},w_{r(1)}=u_{r(2)}^{f_2}(\overline{w}_{r(2)}+\phi_{i_1}(0)),w_{r(2)}=\overline{w}_{r(2)}-[\phi_{i_1}(v)-\phi_{i_1}(0)].$$

We see that $\overline{f}_{r(2)}$ is a morphism at $\overline{p}$, and $\phi_{i_1}(0)=\overline{\phi}_{i_1}(0)$ implies that $\overline{f}_{r(2)}(\overline{p})=q_{r(2)}$.

We have

$$u_{r(2)} = w_{r(2)} = \overline{w}_{r(2)} - [\phi_{i_1}(v) - \phi_{i_1}(0)] = 0$$

and

$$u_{r(2)} = \overline{w}_{r(2)} - [\overline{\phi}_{i_1}(v) - \overline{\phi}_{i_1}(0)] = 0$$

are local equations of (branches of) the fundamental locus of $\overline{f}_{r(1)}$ at $q_{r(1)}$. Thus, since the fundamental locus of $\overline{f}_{r(1)}$ is nonsingular,

$$\phi_{i_1}(v) = \overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_1}(v).$$

Assume that $l \geq 2$,

$$\frac{i_0}{a} = \frac{\overline{i}_0}{\overline{a}}, \frac{i_1}{a} = \frac{\overline{i}_1}{\overline{a}} \text{ and } \frac{i_2}{a} = \frac{\overline{i}_2}{\overline{a}}$$

and $\phi_{i_2}(0) = \overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_2}(0)$ (as well as $\phi_{i_0}(0) = \overline{\phi}_{i_0}(0)$ and $\phi_{i_1}(0) = \overline{\phi}_{i_1}(0)$).

Then

$$\frac{\gcd(a, i_0, i_1)}{a} = \frac{\gcd(\overline{a}, \overline{i}_0, \overline{i}_1)}{\overline{a}}.$$

Now

$$\frac{i_2 - i_1}{a} = \frac{\overline{i}_2 - \overline{i}_1}{\overline{a}}$$

implies

$$\frac{\gcd(a, i_0, i_1)}{i_2 - i_1} = \frac{\gcd(\overline{a}, \overline{i}_0, \overline{i}_1)}{\overline{i}_2 - \overline{i}_1}.$$

The rational map $U \rightarrow V_{r(3)}$ is a morphism at p and $\overline{p}$, $\overline{f}_{r(3)}(p) = \overline{f}_{r(3)}(\overline{p}) = q_{r(3)}$, and

$$\phi_{i_2}(v) = \overline{\phi}_{i_2}(v)$$

since the fundamental locus of $\overline{f}_{r(3)}$ is nonsingular.

Iterating, we see that if $j \leq t$,

$$\frac{i_j}{a} = \frac{\overline{i}_j}{\overline{a}}$$

and

$$\phi_{i_j}(0) = \overline{\phi}_{i_j}(0)$$

for $j \leq t$, then

$$\frac{\gcd(a, i_0, \ldots, i_{j-1})}{i_j - i_{j-1}} = \frac{\gcd(\overline{a}, \overline{i}_0, \ldots, \overline{i}_{j-1})}{\overline{i}_j - \overline{i}_{j-1}}$$

for $j \leq t$ and

$$\phi_{i_j}(v) = \overline{\phi}_{\overline{i}_j}(v)$$

for $j \leq t$.

We have verified that a general point of every one dimensional component of $G_Y(f, \tau)$ is perfect. Thus the conclusions of the lemma hold.

□

Definition 5.15. *Suppose that* $f : X \rightarrow Y$ *is* τ*-prepared. Let* V *be the largest open subset of* Y *on which the conclusions of Lemma 5.12 hold. Let* $\Theta(Y) = \Theta(f, Y)$ *be the set of perfect 1-points in* $V \cap G_Y(f, \tau)$.

Remark 5.16. *Suppose that* f *is* τ*-prepared. Then* $G_Y(f, \tau) - \Theta(f, Y)$ *is a finite set by Lemma 5.14, Lemma 5.12 and Lemma 5.10.*

6. Relations

In this section, we suppose that Y is a nonsingular projective 3-fold with toroidal structure D_Y, and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a dominant proper morphism of nonsingular 3-folds, with toroidal structures D_Y and $D_X = f^{-1}(D_Y)$, such that D_X contains the singular locus of f.

Definition 6.1. *A quasi-pre-relation R on Y is an association U from a locally closed subset $U(R) \subset D_Y$, such that $U(R)$ contains no non trivial open subsets of 2-curves or 3-points and dim $U(R) \le 1$.*

If $q \in U(R)$ is a 2-point,

$$R(q) = (S_R(q), (E_1)_R(q), (E_2)_R(q), w_{R(q)}, u_{R(q)}, v_{R(q)}, e_R(q), a_R(q), b_R(q), \lambda_R(q))$$

with gcd$(a_R(q), b_R(q), e_R(q)) = 1$, $e_R(q) > 1$, $u_{R(q)}, v_{R(q)}, w_{R(q)}$ are (possibly formal) permissible parameters at q with $u_{R(q)}, v_{R(q)} \in \mathcal{O}_{Y,q}$, $0 \ne \lambda_R(q) \in \mathbf{k}$.

We will also allow quasi-pre-relations with $a_R(q) = b_R(q) = \infty$, $e_R(q) = 1$ and $\lambda_R(q) = 1$.

If $q \in U(R)$ is a 1-point,

$$R(q) = (S_R(q), E_R(q), w_{R(q)}, u_{R(q)}, v_{R(q)}, e_R(q), a_R(q), \lambda_R(q))$$

with gcd$(a_R(q), e_R(q)) = 1$, $e_R(q) > 1$, $u_{R(q)}, v_{R(q)}, w_{R(q)}$ are (possibly formal) permissible parameters at q with $u_{R(q)}, v_{R(q)} \in \mathcal{O}_{Y,q}$, $0 \ne \lambda_R(q) \in \mathbf{k}$.

We will also allow quasi-pre-relations with $a_R(q) = \infty$, $e_R(q) = 1$ and $\lambda_R(q) = 1$.

A restriction R' of a quasi-pre-relation R is the association from a locally closed subset $U(R')$ of $U(R)$ such that $R'(q) = R(q)$ for $q \in U(R')$.

Suppose that R is a quasi-pre-relation and $q \in U(R)$ is a 2-point. Let

$$u = u_{R(q)}, v = v_{R(q)}, w = w_{R(q)}, a = a_R(q), b = b_R(q), e = e_R(q), \lambda = \lambda_R(q).$$

If $a, b \ne \infty$, then $R(q)$ is determined by the expression

$$w^e - \lambda u^a v^b. \tag{112}$$

Depending on the signs of a and b, this expression determines a (formal) germ at q of an (irreducible) surface singularity

$$F = F_{R(q)} = 0 \tag{113}$$

of one of the following forms:

$$F = w^e - \lambda u^a v^b = 0$$

if $a, b \ge 0$ and $a + b > 0$,

$$F = w^e u^{-a} - \lambda v^b = 0$$

if $a < 0$, $b > 0$,

$$F = w^e v^{-b} - \lambda u^a = 0$$

if $b < 0$, $a > 0$.

In the remaining case, $a, b \le 0$,

$$F = w^e u^{-a} v^{-b} - \lambda$$

is a unit in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y,q}$ and $F(q) \ne 0$.

If $a, b = \infty$, and $q \in U(R)$ is a 2-point, then $R(q)$ is determined by the expression

$$F = F_{R(q)} = w_{R(q)} = 0. \tag{114}$$

Suppose that R is a quasi-pre-relation, and $q \in U(R)$ is a 1-point. Let

$$u = u_{R(q)}, v = v_{R(q)}, w = w_{R(q)}, a = a_R(q), e = e_R(q), \lambda = \lambda_R(q).$$

Observe that if $a \neq \infty$, then $R(q)$ is determined by the expression

$$w^e - \lambda u^a. \tag{115}$$

This expression determines a (formal) germ at q of an (irreducible) surface singularity

$$F = F_{R(q)} = 0 \tag{116}$$

of the form

$$F = w^e - \lambda u^a = 0.$$

if $a > 0$. In the remaining case, $a \leq 0$, so that

$$F = w^e u^{-a} - \lambda$$

is a unit in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y,q}$ and $F(q) \neq 0$.

If $a = \infty$, and $q \in U(R)$ is a 1-point, then $R(q)$ is determined by the expression

$$F = F_{R(q)} = w_{R(q)} = 0. \tag{117}$$

A quasi-pre-relation R is resolved if $F_{R(q)}$ is a unit in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y,q}$ for all $q \in U(R)$ (This includes the case $U(R) = \emptyset$).

Definition 6.2. *A subvariety G of Y is an admissible center for a quasi-pre-relation R on Y if one of the following holds:*

1. *G is a 2-point.*
2. *G is a 1-point.*
3. *G is a 2-curve of Y.*
4. *$G \subset D_Y$ is a nonsingular curve which contains a 1-point and makes SNCs with D_Y. If $q \in U(R) \cap G$ then the (formal) germ of G at q is contained in the germ $w_{R(q)} = 0$.*

Observe that admissible centers are possible centers.

Suppose that R is a quasi-pre-relation on Y, G is an admissible center for R, and $\Psi : Y_1 \to Y$ is the blow up of G.

Let W be the union over $q \in U(R)$ of points q_1 in $\Psi^{-1}(q)$ such that q_1 is on the strict transform of $w_{R(q)} = 0$. Assume that this is a locally closed subset of D_{Y_1} of dimension ≤ 1 which contains no 2-curves or 3-points (This condition will always be satisfied when R is a pre-relation, Definition 6.3). The transform R^1 of R on Y_1 is then the quasi-pre-relation on Y_1 defined by the condition that $U(R^1) = W$. For such q_1, $R^1(q_1)$ is determined by the following rules:

If $q \in U(R) \cap G$, and

$$u = u_{R(q)}, v = v_{R(q)}, w = w_{R(q)},$$

then G has local equations of one of the following forms at q (corresponding to the cases of Definition 6.2):

1.,2. $u = v = w = 0$,
3. $u = v = 0$,
4. a) q a 2-point, $u = w = 0$ or $v = w = 0$
4. b) q a 1-point, $u = w = 0$.

If $q_1 \in U(R_1) \cap \Psi^{-1}(q)$, then

$$u_1 = u_{R^1(q_1)}, v_1 = v_{R^1(q_1)}, w_1 = w_{R^1(q_1)}$$

are defined, respectively, by

1., 2. $u = u_1, v = u_1(v_1 + \alpha), w = u_1 w_1$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbf{k}$, or $u = u_1 v_1, v = v_1, w = v_1 w_1$,
3. $u = u_1, v = u_1(v_1 + \alpha), w = w_1$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbf{k}$, or $u = u_1 v_1, v = v_1, w = w_1$,

4. a) $u=u_1, w=u_1w_1$ or $v=v_1, w=v_1w_1$
4. b) $u=u_1, v=v_1, w=u_1w_1$.

Suppose that $q_1\in U(R^1)\cap\Psi^{-1}(q)$ and case 1 holds. Suppose that

$$R(q)=(S,E,w,u,v,e,a,b,\lambda).$$

If $0\ne\alpha$ and $a,b\ne\infty$, we define

$$a_{R^1}(q_1)=a+b-e, b_{R^1}(q_1)=b, e_{R^1}(q_1)=e, \lambda_{R^1}(q_1)=\lambda\alpha^b.$$

$R^1(q_1)$ is thus determined by

$$w_1^e-\lambda\alpha^bu_1^{a+b-e}.$$

If $a,b\ne\infty$ and

$$u=u_1, v=u_1v_1, w=u_1w_1,$$

we define

$$a_{R^1}(q_1)=a+b-e, b_{R^1}(q_1)=b, e_{R^1}(q_1)=e, \lambda_{R^1}(q_1)=\lambda.$$

$R^1(q_1)$ is determined by $w_1^e-\lambda u_1^{a+b-e}v_1^b$.

If $a,b\ne\infty$ and

$$u=u_1v_1, v=v_1, w=v_1w_1,$$

we define

$$a_{R^1}(q_1)=a, b_{R^1}(q_1)=a+b-e, e_{R^1}(q_1)=e, \lambda_{R^1}(q_1)=\lambda.$$

$R^1(q_1)$ is determined by $w_1^e-\lambda u_1^av_1^{a+b-e}$.

If $a=b=\infty$, we define

$$a_{R^1}(q_1)=\infty, b_{R^1}(q_1)=\infty, e_{R^1}(q_1)=1, \lambda_{R^1}(q_1)=1,$$

and $R^1(q_1)$ is determined by $w_{R^1(q_1)}$.

In cases 3 and 4, we define $R^1(q_1)$ in an analogous way.

Suppose that $\Psi_1:Y_1\rightarrow Y$ is a sequence of blow ups of admissible centers for (the transforms of) R, R^1 is the transform of R on Y_1, $q\in U(R)$ and $q_1\in\Psi_1^{-1}(q)\cap U(R^1)$. Let

$$u=u_{R(q)}, v=v_{R(q)}, w=w_{R(q)}.$$

$$u_1=u_{R^1(q_1)}, v_1=v_{R^1(q_1)}, w_1=w_{R^1(q_1)}.$$

u and v are related to u_1,v_1 birationally. That is, $k(u,v)=k(u_1,v_1)$. We have one of the following expressions:

$$u=u_1^av_1^b, v=u_1^cv_1^d, w=u_1^ev_1^fw_1 \tag{118}$$

with $ad-bc=\pm1$,

$$u=u_1^a\gamma_1(u_1,v_1), v=u_1^b\gamma_2(u_1,v_1), w=u_1^c\gamma_3(u_1,v_1)w_1 \tag{119}$$

where $\gamma_1,\gamma_2,\gamma_3$ are unit series,

$$u=(u_1^av_1^b)^t\gamma_1(u_1,v_1), v_1=(u_1^av_1^b)^k\gamma_2(u_1,v_1), w=u_1^ev_1^f\gamma_3(u_1,v_1)w_1 \tag{120}$$

where $\gcd(a,b)=1$, and $\gamma_1,\gamma_2,\gamma_3$ are unit series.

Definition 6.3. *A quasi-pre-relation R is a pre-relation if there exists a nonsingular 3-fold $\overline{Y}_R$ with toroidal structure $D_{\overline{Y}_1}$, a pre-relation R^0 on $\overline{Y}_R$ such that $U(R^0)=\{\overline{q}\}$ is a single point with*

$$R^0(\overline{q})=(\cdots,w_{R^0(\overline{q})},u_{R^0(\overline{q})},v_{R^0(\overline{q})},\cdots)$$

and a sequence of possible blow ups

$$\overline{\Psi}_R:Y=Y_n\rightarrow\cdots\rightarrow Y_1\rightarrow Y_0=\overline{Y}_R$$

where each Y_i has a quasi-pre-relation R^i which is the restriction of the transform of R^{i-1}, and $Y_{i+1}\rightarrow Y_i$ is an admissible blow up for R^i, and $R=R^n$.

Definition 6.4. *A pre-relation R on Y is algebraic if there exists an open subset V of Y and a nonsingular irreducible closed surface $\Omega(R)\subset V$ such that $\Omega(R)$ makes SNCs with D_Y, $U(R)\subset\Omega(R)$ and $S_R(q)$ is the (formal) germ of $\Omega(R)$ at q for all $q\in U(R)$. Further, if $q\in\Omega(R)\cap D_Y$, then there exist super parameters u_R,v_R,w_R at q such that $w_R=0$ is a local equation of $\Omega(R)$.*

Suppose that R is algebraic, and $\Psi:Y_1\rightarrow Y$ is an admissible blow up. then after possibly replacing $\Omega(R)$ with an open subset of $\Omega(R)$ (containing $U(R)$), we have that the transform R^1 of R is algebraic, where $\Omega(R^1)$ is the strict transform of $\Omega(R)$ by Ψ.

Definition 6.5. *Suppose that $f:X\rightarrow Y$ is prepared.*

A primitive relation R for f is

1. *A pre-relation $\overline{R}$ on Y.*
2. *A locally closed subset $T(R)\subset f^{-1}(U(\overline{R}))$ such that if $p\in T(R)$ and $f(p)$ is a 2-point with*

$$\overline{R}(f(p))=(S,E_1,E_2,w,u,v,e,a,b,\lambda),$$

then u,v are toroidal forms at p. If $a,b\neq\infty$, then there exist permissible parameters x,y,z at p for u,v,w such that

$$w^e=u^av^b\overline{\Lambda}(x,y,z)\tag{121}$$

where $\overline{\Lambda}(0,0,0)=\lambda$.

If $a=b=\infty$, then u,v,w have a monomial form (Definition 3.4) at p.

If $f(p)$ is a 1-point with

$$\overline{R}(f(p))=(S,E,w,u,v,e,a,\lambda),$$

then u,v are toroidal forms at p. If $a\neq\infty$, then there exist permissible parameters x,y,z at p for u,v,w such that

$$w^e=u^a\overline{\Lambda}(x,y,z)\tag{122}$$

where $\overline{\Lambda}(0,0,0)=\lambda$.

If $a=\infty$, then u,v,w have a monomial form (Definition 3.4) at p.

In all cases, we define $R(p)=\overline{R}(f(p))$.

A relation R for f is a finite set of pre-relations $\{\overline{R}_i\}$ on Y with associated primitive relations R_i for f such that the sets $T(R_i)$ are pairwise disjoint.

We denote $U(R)=\cup_iU(\overline{R}_i)$ and $T(R)=\cup_iT(R_i)$, and define

$$R(p)=R_i(p)$$

if $p\in T(R_i)$.

If $U(\overline{R}_i)\cap U(\overline{R}_j)\neq\emptyset$, then we further require that $Y_{\overline{R}_i}=Y_{\overline{R}_j}$ (with the notation of Definition 6.3) and $u_{(\overline{R}_i)^0(\overline{q})}=u_{(\overline{R}_j)^0(\overline{q})}$, $v_{(\overline{R}_i)^0(\overline{q})}=v_{(\overline{R}_j)^0(\overline{q})}$. This implies that

$$u_{\overline{R}_i(q)}=u_{\overline{R}_j(q)}, v_{\overline{R}_i(q)}=v_{\overline{R}_j(q)}$$

if $q\in U(\overline{R}_i)\cap U(\overline{R}_j)$. We will call $\{\overline{R}_i\}$ the pre-relations associated to R. We will say that R is algebraic if each $\overline{R}_i$ is algebraic and

$$\Omega(\overline{R}_i)\cap U(R)=U(\overline{R}_i) \tag{123}$$

for all i. We will also denote $\Omega(R_i)=\Omega(\overline{R}_i)$. For $p\in T(R_i)\subset T(R)$, we denote

$$R(p)=\begin{pmatrix} S=S_R(p),E_1(p),E_2(p),w=w_{R(p)},u=u_{R(p)},\\ v=v_{R(p)},e=e_R(p),a=a_R(p),b=b_R(p),\lambda=\lambda_R(p)\end{pmatrix}$$

if $f(p)$ is a 2-point,

$$R(p)=\begin{pmatrix} S=S_R(p),E(p),w=w_{R(p)},u=u_{R(p)},\\ v=v_{R(p)},e=e_R(p),a=a_R(p),\lambda=\lambda_R(p)\end{pmatrix}$$

if $f(p)$ is a 1-point.

A relation R is resolved if $T(R)=\emptyset$.

Definition 6.6. *Suppose that $f:X\rightarrow Y$ is prepared, R is a relation for f and*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

is a commutative diagram such that

1. *Ψ is a product of blow ups which are admissible for all of the pre-relations $\overline{R}_i$ associated to R (and their transforms) and Φ is a product of blow ups of possible centers*
2. *f_1 is prepared.*
3. *Let $\overline{R}_i^1$ be the transforms of the $\overline{R}_i$ on Y_1 and let*
$$T_i=\{p\in X_1\mid p\in\Phi^{-1}(T(R_i))\cap f_1^{-1}(U(\overline{R}_i^1))\}.$$
Suppose that $p\in T_i$ then $u_{\overline{R}_i^1(f_1(p))}, v_{\overline{R}_i^1(f_1(p))}$ are toroidal forms at p.

Then the transform R^1 of R for f_1 is the relation for f_1 defined by

$$T(R^1)=\cup T_i,$$

$$R^1(p)=\overline{R}_i^1(f_1(p))$$

for $p\in T_i$.

It is straightforward to verify that R^1 satisfies the conditions of Definition 6.5, substituting from (121), (122) and (118) - (120) into (3.1).

7. Well Prepared Morphisms

Suppose that $\tau\in\mathbf{N}$ and $f:X\rightarrow Y$ is a dominant, proper, τ-prepared morphism of nonsingular 3-folds with toroidal structures D_Y and $D_X=f^{-1}(D_Y)$. Further suppose that the singular locus of f is contained in D_X. If R is a relation for f with associated pre-relations $\{\overline{R}_i\}$, then for $p\in T(R_i)$ such that $f(p)=q$ is a 2-point, we have that

$$R(p)=\begin{pmatrix} S_i=S_R(p),E_1=E_{R,1}(p),E_2=E_{R,2}(p),w_i=w_{R(p)},u=u_{R(p)},\\ v=v_{R(p)},e_i=e_R(p),a_i=a_R(p),b_i=b_R(p),\overline{\lambda}_i=\lambda_R(p)\end{pmatrix} \tag{124}$$

which we will abbreviate (as in (112)) as

$$R(p) = w_i^{e_i} - \overline{\lambda}_i u^{a_i} v^{b_i}, \tag{125}$$

with $e_i > 1$, if $a_i, b_i \neq \infty$, or (as in (114))

$$R(p) = w_i \tag{126}$$

if $a_i, b_i = \infty$. In this case, u, v, w_i have a monomial form (Definition 3.4) at p.

For $p \in T(R_i)$ such that $f(p) = q$ is a 1-point, we have that

$$R(p) = \left(\begin{array}{l} S_i = S_R(p), E_1 = E_{R,1}(p), w_i = w_{R(p)}, u = u_{R(p)}, \\ v = v_{R(p)}, e_i = e_R(p), a_i = a_R(p), \overline{\lambda}_i = \lambda_R(p) \end{array} \right) \tag{127}$$

which we will abbreviate (as in (112)) as

$$R(p) = w_i^{e_i} - \overline{\lambda}_i u^{a_i}, \tag{128}$$

with $e_i > 1$, if $a_i \neq \infty$, or (as in (114))

$$R(p) = w_i \tag{129}$$

if $a_i = \infty$. In this case, u, v, w_i have a monomial form (Definition 3.4) at p.

Recall that if $p' \in T(R)$ is such that $f(p') = f(p)$, then $u_{R(p')} = u_{R(p)} = u$ and $v_{R(p')} = v_{R(p)} = v$. Let I be an index set for the pre-relations $\{\overline{R}_i\}$ associated to R.

Definition 7.1. *Suppose that $\tau \geq 0$. A τ-prepared morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared with relation R if:*

1. $T(R) = G_X(f, \tau) \cap f^{-1}(U(R))$
2. *Suppose that $p \in T(R)$. Then $\tau > 0$ implies $R(p)$ has a form (125) or (128), $\tau = 0$ implies $R(p)$ has a form (126) or (129).*
3. *If $q \in U(\overline{R}_i) \cap U(\overline{R}_j)$, then there exists $\lambda_{ij}(u, v) \in \mathbf{k}[[u, v]]$, with*

   $$u = u_{\overline{R}_i(q)} = u_{\overline{R}_j(q)}, v = v_{\overline{R}_i(q)} = v_{\overline{R}_j(q)}, w_i = w_{\overline{R}_i(q)}, w_j = w_{\overline{R}_j(q)}$$

   such that

   $$w_j = w_i + \lambda_{ij}(u, v),$$

   and with the notation of Definition 6.5, there exists a series

   $$(\lambda_{ij})^0(u_{(\overline{R}_j)^0(\overline{q})}, v_{(\overline{R}_j)^0(\overline{q})})$$

   such that

   $$w_{(\overline{R}_j)^0(\overline{q})} - w_{(\overline{R}_i)^0(\overline{q})} = (\lambda_{ij})^0(u_{(\overline{R}_j)^0(\overline{q})}, v_{(\overline{R}_j)^0(\overline{q})}),$$

   and $\lambda_{ij}(u, v)$ is obtained from $\lambda_{ij}^0(u_{(\overline{R}_j)^0(\overline{q})}, v_{(\overline{R}_j)^0(\overline{q})})$ from the appropriate expression (118) - (120).
4. *Suppose that $q \in U(\overline{R}_i)$, where $\overline{R}_i$ is a relation associated to R. Then $u = u_{\overline{R}_i(q)}, v = v_{\overline{R}_i(q)}, w_i = w_{\overline{R}_i(q)}$ are super parameters at q (Definition 5.1).*

f is τ-quasi-well prepared with relation R if f is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared with $T(R) = G_X(f, \tau)$.

We will allow a τ-prepared morphism without relation ($U(R) = \emptyset$) as a type of pre-τ-quasi-well prepared morphism.

Definition 7.2. *$f : X \rightarrow Y$ is τ-quasi-well prepared with relation R and pre-algebraic structure if f is τ-quasi-well prepared with relation R and $u_{\overline{R}_i(q)}, v_{\overline{R}_i(q)}, w_{\overline{R}_i(q)} \in \mathcal{O}_{Y,q}$ for all $\overline{R}_i$ associated to R, and $q \in U(\overline{R}_i)$.*

Definition 7.3. *$f : X \rightarrow Y$ is τ-well prepared with relation R if*

1. *f is τ-quasi-well prepared with relation R and pre-algebraic structure.*

2. *The primitive pre-relations* $\{\overline{R}_i\}$ *associated to* R *are algebraic, and* R *is algebraic (Definition 6.5).*
3. *Suppose that* $q \in U(\overline{R}_i) \cap U(\overline{R}_j)$. *Let* $w_i = w_{\overline{R}_i(q)}$ *and* $w_j = w_{\overline{R}_j(q)}$, $u = u_{\overline{R}_i(q)} = u_{\overline{R}_j(q)}, v = v_{\overline{R}_i(q)} = v_{\overline{R}_j(q)}$.

   Suppose that q *is a 2-point. Then there exists a unit series* $\phi_{ij} \in \mathbf{k}[[u,v]]$ *and* $a_{ij}, b_{ij} \in \mathbf{N}$ *(or* $\phi_{ij} = 0$ *with* $a_{ij} = b_{ij} = -\infty$*) with*

   $$w_j = w_i + u^{a_{ij}} v^{b_{ij}} \phi_{ij}. \tag{130}$$

   Suppose that q *is a 1-point. Then there exists a unit series* $\phi_{ij} \in \mathbf{k}[[u,v]]$ *and* $c_{ij} \in \mathbf{N}$ *(or* $\phi_{ij} = 0$ *with* $c_{ij} = -\infty$*) with*

   $$w_j = w_i + u^{c_{ij}} \phi_{ij}. \tag{131}$$

4. *For* $q \in U(R)$ *a 2-point, set* $I_q = \{i \in I \mid q \in U(\overline{R}_i)\}$. *Then the set*

   $$\{(a_{ij}, b_{ij}) \mid i,j \in I_q\} \tag{132}$$

   from equation (130) is totally ordered.

Definition 7.4. *Suppose that* $f : X \to Y$ *is pre-*τ*-quasi-well prepared,* $\overline{q} \in Y$ *is a 1-point such that* $\overline{q} \notin U(R)$. *A curve* $C \subset D_Y$ *such that* $\overline{q} \in C$ *is called a* **resolving curve** *for* f *and* R *at* $\overline{q}$ *if*

1. C *makes SNCs with* D_Y.
2. $C \cap G_Y(f,\tau) \subset \{\overline{q}\}$.
3. *If* $q \in C$ *is a 2-point, then there exist super parameters* u, v, w *at* q *such that* $u = w = 0$ *are local equations of* C *at* q.
4. *If* $q \in C$ *is a 1-point, then there exist permissible parameters* u, v, w *at* q *such that* u, v *are toroidal forms at* p *for all* $p \in f^{-1}(q)$, *and* $u = v = 0$ *are local equations of* C *at* q.

Definition 7.5. *Suppose that* $f : X \to Y$ *is pre-*τ*-quasi-well prepared with relation* R.

1. *A 2-point* $q \in U(R)$ *is prepared for* R.
2. *A 1-point or 2-point* $q \in Y$ *such that* $q \notin U(R)$ *is prepared for* R *if there exist super parameters* u, v, w *at* q.
3. *A 2-curve* $C \subset Y$ *is prepared for* R.
4. *A 1-point* $q \in U(R)$ *is prepared.*
5. *A resolving curve* C *for* f *and* R *at a 1-point* $q \notin U(R)$ *is prepared.*

If E is a component of D_Y, $\overline{R}_i$ is pre-algebraic, and $q \in U(\overline{R}_i)$, we will denote $\overline{E \cdot S_{\overline{R}_i}(q)}$ for the Zariski closure in Y of the curve germ $u = w_{\overline{R}_i(q)} = 0$ at q, where $u = 0$ is a local equation of E.

Definition 7.6. *Suppose that* $f : X \to Y$ *is* τ*-well prepared with relation* R *for* f. *A nonsingular curve* $C \subset D_Y$ *which makes SNCs with* D_Y *is prepared for* R *of type 6 if*

1. $C = \overline{E_\alpha \cdot S_{\overline{R}_i}(q_\beta)}$ *for some component* E_α *of* D_Y, *pre-relation* $\overline{R}_i$ *associated to* R *and* $q_\beta \in U(\overline{R}_i)$.
2. $\Omega(\overline{R}_i)$ *contains* C.
3. *If* $C' = \overline{E_\gamma \cdot S_{\overline{R}_j}(q_\delta)}$ *is such that* $C' \subset \Omega(\overline{R}_j)$, $C \neq C'$, *and* $q \in C \cap C'$, *then* $q \in U(\overline{R}_i) \cap U(\overline{R}_j)$ *and* $C' = \overline{E_\gamma \cdot S_{\overline{R}_j}(q)}$.
4. *If* $j \neq i$ *and* $C = \overline{E_\gamma \cdot S_{\overline{R}_j}(q_\delta)}$ *then* C *satisfies 1 and 2 and 3 of this definition (for* $\overline{R}_j$*). (In this case we have by (123) that* $U(\overline{R}_j) \cap C = U(\overline{R}_i) \cap C$*).*

5. *Let*

$$I_C=\{j\in I\mid C=\overline{E_\gamma\cdot S_{\overline{R}_j}(q_\delta)}\text{ for some }\overline{R}_j,E_\gamma,q_\delta\in U(\overline{R}_j)\}.$$

Suppose that $q\in C$ is a 1-point or a 2-point such that $q\not\in U(R)$. Then there exist $u,v\in\mathcal{O}_{Y,q}$ such that for $j\in I_C$ there exists $\tilde w_j\in\mathcal{O}_{Y,q}$ such that

(a) *$\tilde w_j=0$ is a local equation of $\Omega(\overline{R}_j)$ and $u,v,\tilde w_j$ are permissible parameters at q such that $u=\tilde w_j=0$ are local equations of C at q.*

(b) *$u,v,\tilde w_j$ are super parameters at q.*

(c) *If $i,j\in I_C$ and q is a 1-point, there exist relations*

$$\tilde w_i-\tilde w_j=u^{c_{ij}}\phi_{ij}(u,v)$$

where ϕ_{ij} is a unit series (or $\phi_{ij}=0$ and $c_{ij}=-\infty$).

(d) *If $i,j\in I_C$ and q is a 2-point (with $q\not\in U(R)$) then there exist relations*

$$\tilde w_i-\tilde w_j=u^{c_{ij}}v^{d_{ij}}\phi_{ij}(u,v)$$

where ϕ_{ij} is a unit series (or $\phi_{ij}=0$ and $c_{ij}=d_{ij}=-\infty$), and the set $\{(c_{ij},d_{ij})\}$ is totally ordered.

If $f:X\rightarrow Y$ is τ-well prepared with relation R, and $\overline{R}_i$ is a pre-relation associated to R, we will feel free to replace $\Omega(\overline{R}_i)$ with an open subset of $\Omega(\overline{R}_i)$ containing $U(\overline{R}_i)$, and all curves $C=\overline{E\cdot S_{\overline{R}_i}(q)}$ such that E is a component of D_Y, $q\in U(\overline{R}_i)$ and C is prepared for R of type 6. This convention will allow some simplification of the statements of the theorems and proofs.

Definition 7.7. *$f:X\rightarrow Y$ is τ-very-well prepared with relation R if*

1. *f is τ-well prepared with relation R.*
2. *If E is a component of D_Y and $q\in U(\overline{R}_i)\cap E$, then $C=\overline{E\cdot S_{\overline{R}_i}(q)}$ is prepared for R of type 6 (Definition 7.6).*
3. *For all $\overline{R}_i$ associated to R, let*

$$V_i(Y)=\left\{\gamma=\overline{E_\alpha\cdot S_{\overline{R}_i}(q_\gamma)}\mid q_\gamma\in U(\overline{R}_i),E_\alpha\text{ is a component of }D_Y\right\}.$$

Then

$$F_i=\sum_{\gamma\in V_i(Y)}\gamma$$

is a SNC divisor on $\Omega(\overline{R}_i)$ whose intersection graph is a forest (its connected components are trees).

If $f:X\rightarrow Y$ is τ-very-well prepared, we will feel free to replace $\Omega(\overline{R}_i)$ with an open neighborhood of F_i in $\Omega(\overline{R}_i)$. This will allow some simplification of the proofs.

Remark 7.8. *Suppose that $f:X\rightarrow Y$ is τ-very well prepared. Then it follows from Definition 7.7 and (123) that $F_i\cap U(R)=U(\overline{R}_i)$ for all $\overline{R}_i$ associated to R.*

Definition 7.9. *Suppose that $f:X\rightarrow Y$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (or τ-well prepared or τ-very-well prepared) with relation R. Let $\{\overline{R}_i\}$ be the pre-relations associated to R. Suppose that G is a point or nonsingular curve in Y which is an admissible center for all of the $\overline{R}_i$. Then G is called a permissible center for R if there exists a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd} \tag{133}$$

where Ψ is the blow up of G and Φ is a sequence of blow ups

$$X_1=\overline{X}_n\to\cdots\to\overline{X}_1\to X$$

of nonsingular curves and 3-points γ_i which are possible centers such that

1. *f_1 is τ-prepared and the assumptions of Definition 6.6 hold so that the transform R^1 of R for f_1 is defined.*
2. $$\tau_{f_1}(p)\le\tau_f(\phi(p))$$
   for $p\in D_{X_1}$.
3. *$f_1:X_1\to Y_1$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared, (or τ-well prepared or τ-very-well prepared) with relation R^1.*

(133) is called a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (or τ-well prepared or τ-very-well prepared) diagram of R (and Ψ).

Definition 7.10. *Suppose that $f:X\to Y$ is τ-well prepared (or τ-very-well prepared) with relation R and $C\subset Y$ is prepared for R of type 6. Then C is a $*$-permissible center for R if there exists a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}\tag{134}$$

such that

1. *f_1 is τ-prepared and the assumptions of Definition 6.6 hold so that the transform R^1 of R for f_1 is defined.*
2. $$\tau_{f_1}(p)\le\tau_f(\phi(p))$$
   for $p\in D_{X_1}$.
3. *$f_1:X_1\to Y_1$ is pre-τ-well prepared (or τ-very-well prepared).*
4. *(134) has a factorization*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1=\overline{X}_m \arrow[r, "f_1=\overline{f}_m"] \arrow[d] & \overline{Y}_m=Y_1 \arrow[d] \\
\vdots \arrow[d] & \vdots \arrow[d] \\
\overline{X}_2 \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_2"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_2"'] & \overline{Y}_2 \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_2"] \\
\overline{X}_1 \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_1"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_1"'] & \overline{Y}_1 \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_1"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}\tag{135}$$

where $\overline{\Psi}_1$ is the blow up of C,

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{X}_1 \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_1"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_1"'] & \overline{Y}_1 \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_1"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}\tag{136}$$

is a τ-well prepared diagram of R and $\overline{\Psi}_1$ of the form (133), each $\overline{\Psi}_{i+1}:\overline{Y}_{i+1}\to\overline{Y}_i$ for $i\ge1$ is the blow up of a 2-point $q\in\overline{Y}_i$ which is prepared for *the transform* R^i *of* R *on* $\overline{X}_i$ *of type 2 of Definition 7.5, and*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{X}_{i+1} \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_{i+1}"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_{i+1}"'] & \overline{Y}_{i+1} \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_{i+1}"] \\
\overline{X}_i \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_i"] & \overline{Y}_i
\end{tikzcd}$$

is a τ*-well prepared diagram of* R^i *and* $\overline{\Psi}_{i+1}$ *of the form of (133).*

5. *Suppose that* E *is the strict transform of* $\overline{\Psi}_1^{-1}(C)$ *on* Y_1*. then* $\overline{E\cdot\overline{R}_i^1(q)}$ *is prepared for* R^1 *of type 6 for all primitive relations* $\overline{R}_i^1$ *associated to* R^1*, and* $q\in U(R_i^1)\cap E$*.*
6. *Suppose that* $\gamma\subset Y$ *is a curve which is prepared for* R *of type 6. Then the strict transform of* γ *on* Y_1 *is prepared for* R^1 *of type 6.*

Definition 7.11. *Suppose that* $f: X\rightarrow Y$ *is pre-*τ*-quasi-well prepared (or* τ*-well prepared or* τ*-very-well prepared) with relation* R*. Suppose that*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd} \tag{137}$$

is a commutative diagram such that there is a factorization

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1=\overline{X}_m \arrow[r, "f_1=\overline{f}_m"] \arrow[d] & \overline{Y}_m=Y_1 \arrow[d] \\
\vdots \arrow[d] & \vdots \arrow[d] \\
\overline{X}_2 \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_2"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_2"'] & \overline{Y}_2 \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_2"] \\
\overline{X}_1 \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_1"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_1"'] & \overline{Y}_1 \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_1"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd} \tag{138}$$

where each commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{X}_{i+1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_{i+1}"'] & \overline{Y}_{i+1} \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_{i+1}"] \\
\overline{X}_i \arrow[r] & \overline{Y}_i
\end{tikzcd}$$

is either of the form (133) or of the form (134). Then (137) is called a pre-τ*-quasi-well prepared (or* τ*-well prepared or* τ*-very-well prepared) diagram of* R *(and* Ψ*).*

8. Construction of τ-well prepared diagrams

Lemma 8.1. *Suppose that* $f: X\rightarrow Y$ *is pre-*τ*-quasi-well prepared (or* τ*-well prepared or* τ*-very-well prepared) and* $C\subset Y$ *is a 2-curve. Then* C *is a permissible center for* R*, and there exists a pre-*τ*-quasi-well-prepared (or* τ*-well prepared or* τ*-very-well prepared) diagram (133) of* R *and the blow up* $\Psi: Y_1\rightarrow Y$ *of* C *such that* Φ *is a product of blow ups of 2-curves. Furthermore,*

1. Φ *is an isomorphism over* $f^{-1}(Y-C)$
2. *Further suppose that* f *is* τ*-well prepared. Then*

  (a) *Let E be the exceptional divisor for Ψ. Suppose that $q \in U(\overline{R}_i^1) \cap E$ for some $\overline{R}_i$ associated to R. Let $\gamma_i = \overline{S_{\overline{R}_i^1}(q) \cdot E}$. Then $\gamma_i = \Psi^{-1}(\Psi(q))$ is a prepared curve for R^1 of type 6.*
  (b) *If γ is a prepared curve for R, then the strict transform of γ on Y_1 is a prepared curve for R^1.*
3. *Suppose that $\overline{q} \in C$, $p \in f^{-1}(\overline{q})$, $p' \in \Phi_1^{-1}(p)$, u, v, w are permissible parameters at $\overline{q}$ such that $u = v = 0$ are local equations of C, and w is good at p. If w is not good at p', then $\tau_{f_1}(p') < \tau_f(p)$.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 5.4 and a straight forward extension of the proofs of Lemma 5.2 [C5] and Lemma 7.11 [C5]. 3 follows from calculations as will be given in detail in the proof of 6 of Lemma 8.4. □

The proofs of Remarks 8.2 and 8.3 follow easily from the methods of the proof of Lemma 8.1.

Remark 8.2. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (or τ-well prepared or τ-very-well prepared) and $C \subset D_X$ is a 2-curve or a 3-point. Let $\Phi_1 : X_1 \rightarrow X$ be the blow up of C, $f_1 = f \circ \Phi_1 : X_1 \rightarrow Y$. Then*

1. *f_1 is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (or τ-well prepared or τ-very well prepared).*
2. *Suppose that $p_1 \in X_1$, $p = \Phi_1(p_1)$, $q = f_1(p)$, u, v, w are permissible parameters at q such that w is good (weakly good) at p for f. If w is not good (weakly good) at p_1 for f, then $\tau_{f_1}(p_1) < \tau_f(p)$.*
3. *$(f \circ \Phi_1)^{-1}(\Theta(f, Y)) \subset \Theta(f_1, Y_1)$.*

Remark 8.3. *The proof of Lemma 8.1 shows that if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (or τ-well prepared or τ-very-well prepared), $C \subset Y$ is a 2-curve, $\Psi : Y_1 \rightarrow Y$ is the blow up of C and $\Phi : X_1 \rightarrow X$ is a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves and 3-points such that the rational map $f_1 : X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ is a morphism, then*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (or τ-well prepared or τ-very-well prepared) for R and Ψ. In fact, with the above notation, if f satisfies 1 – 3 of Definition 7.1, then f_1 satisfies 1 – 3 of Definition 7.1. Further, 2 and 3 of the conclusions of Lemma 8.1 hold.

Lemma 8.4. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (or τ-well prepared), $\overline{q} \in Y$ is a 1-point such that $\overline{q} \notin U(R)$, and $C \subset D_Y$ is a resolving curve for f at $\overline{q}$. Then there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared) diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

such that

1. *Ψ_1 is the blow up of C,*
2. *Φ_1 is a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves.*
3. *$\tau_{f_1}(p_1) \le \tau_f(\Phi_1(p_1))$ for $p_1 \in X_1$. Thus $\tau_{f_1}(p_1) < \tau$ if $p_1 \in (\Psi_1 \circ f_1)^{-1}(C - \{\overline{q}\})$.*
4. *Suppose that $C_1 \subset Y_1$ is a section over C, $q \in C$ is a 1-point, u, v, w are permissible parameters at q such that $u = v = 0$ are local equations of C, u, v are toroidal forms at p for all $p \in f^{-1}(q)$, and $q_1 \in C_1 \cap \Psi_1^{-1}(q)$ is a 1-point.*

Then there exist permissible parameters $\overline{u}_1, \overline{v}_1, w$ *at* q_1 *such that* $\overline{u}_1, \overline{v}_1$ *are torodial forms at* p_1 *for all* $p_1 \in f_1^{-1}(q_1)$*, and* $\overline{u}_1 = \overline{v}_1 = 0$ *is a local equation of* C_1*.*

5. *Suppose that* $\overline{p} \in f^{-1}(\overline{q})$*,* $p' \in \Phi_1^{-1}(\overline{p})$*,* u, v, w *are permissible parameters at* $\overline{q}$ *such that* $u = v = 0$ *are local equations of* C*, and* w *is good at* $\overline{p}$ *for* f*. If* w *is not good at* p' *for* f_1*, then* $\tau_{f_1}(p') < \tau_f(\overline{p})$*.*

Proof. Suppose that $q \in C$ is a 1-point. Then there exist permissible parameters u, v, w at q such that $u = v = 0$ are local equations of C, and if $p \in f^{-1}(q)$, then u, v are toroidal forms at p. Thus there exist permissible parameters x, y, z at p for u, v, w such that one of the forms (6) or (7) hold.

If $q \in C$ is a 2-point, then there exist super parameters u, v, w at q such that $u = w = 0$ are local equations of C. Thus if $p \in f^{-1}(q)$, then there exist permissible parameters x, y, z at p for u, v, w such that one of the forms (62) - (65) hold.

By Lemma 3.13 [C5] and Remark 8.2, after blowing up 2-curves and 3-points by a morphism $\Phi_0 : X_0 \to X$ such that if $q \in C$ is a 2-point, u, v, w are the above permissible parameters at q, and $p \in (f \circ \Phi_0)^{-1}(q)$, then (x^ay^b, x^ey^f, x^gy^h) is a principal ideal if (63) holds at p, $((x^ay^b)^k, (x^ay^b)^l, x^cy^d)$ is principal if (64) holds at p, $(x^ay^bz^c, x^gy^hz^i, z^jy^kz^l)$ is principal if (65) holds at p. We further have that $f \circ \Phi_0$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared). In particular,

$$\tau_{f\circ\Phi_0}(p) \le \tau_f(\Phi_0(p))$$

for $p \in X_0$.

We now analyze the points $p \in X_0$ where $\mathcal{I}_C\mathcal{O}_{X_0}$ is not principal.

First suppose that $q \in C$ is a 1-point, $p \in X_0$, and $f \circ \Phi_0(p) = q$.

If p is a 1-point then we have an expression

$$u = x^a, v = y$$

and $u = v = 0$ are local equations of C. The non principal locus has local equations $x = y = 0$

If p is a 2-point then

$$u = (x^ay^b)^k, v = z$$

and $u = v = 0$ are local equations of C. The non principal locus has local equations $\{x = z = 0\} \cup \{y = z = 0\}$

Now suppose that $q \in C$ is a 2-point and $f \circ \Phi_0(p) = q$.

If p is a 1-point of the form (62), then

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= x^b(\alpha + y) \\ w &= x^c\gamma(x, y) + x^d(z + \beta). \end{aligned}$$

$u = w = 0$ are local equations of C. If p is in the non principal locus then we have (after possibly making a change of variables in z) $w = x^dz$ with $d < a$ and $x = z = 0$ are local equations of the non principal locus.

If p is a 2-point of the form (63), then

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^ay^b \\ v &= x^cy^d \\ w &= x^ey^f\gamma(x, y) + x^gy^h(z + \beta). \end{aligned}$$

$u = w = 0$ are local equations of C. If p is in the non principal locus then (after possibly making a change of variables in z), we have $w = x^gy^hz$ with $(g, h) < (a, b)$. Local equations of the non principal locus are $x = z = 0$ (if $g < a$, $h = b$), $y = z = 0$ (if $g = a$, $h < b$) and $\{x = z = 0\} \cup \{y = z = 0\}$ if $g < a$ and $h < b$.

If p is a 2-point of the form (64), then

$$\begin{aligned} u &= (x^ay^b)^k \\ v &= (x^ay^b)^t(\alpha+z) \\ w &= (x^ay^b)^l\gamma(x^ay^b,z)+x^cy^d \end{aligned}$$

$u=w=0$ are local equations of C, and p is in the principal locus.

If p is a 3-point, of the form (65), then

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^ay^bz^c \\ v &= x^dy^ez^f \\ w &= x^gy^hz^i\gamma+x^jy^kz^l \end{aligned}$$

$u=w=0$ are local equations of C, and p is in the principal locus.

We see that the non principal locus of $\mathcal{I}_C\mathcal{O}_{X_0}$ is a union of nonsingular curves which are possible centers and are not 2-curves.

Let $U_0\subset X_0$ be the largest open set on which the rational map $\overline{f}_0=\Psi_1^{-1}\circ f\circ\Phi_0 : X_0\rightarrow Y_1$ is a morphism. We will now show that $\overline{f}_0 : U_0\rightarrow Y_1$ is τ-prepared, and $\tau_{\overline{f}_0}(p)\le\tau_f(\Phi_0(p))$ for $p\in U_0$.

Suppose that $p\in U_0\cap(f\circ\Phi_0)^{-1}(C)$. Then $(f\circ\Phi_0)(p)=q$ is a 2-point, and there exist super parameters u,v,w at q such that $u=w=0$ are local equations of C, and one of the forms (62) - (65) hold for u,v,w at p. Let $q_1=\overline{f}_0(p)$. We have permissible parameters u_1,v,w_1 in $\mathcal{O}_{Y_1,q_1}$ such that either

$$u=u_1, w=u_1(w_1+\delta)$$

with $\delta\in\mathbf{k}$, or

$$u=u_1w_1, w=w_1.$$

The most difficult case to analyze is when p is a 3-point, (so that u,v,w satisfy (65)), $\tau_{f\circ\Phi_0}(p)\ge 0$, and $u=u_1w_1, w=w_1$. We will work out this case in detail. Since q is a 2-point, we will then have that

$$\tau_{\overline{f}_0}(p)\le\tau_{f\circ\Phi_0}(p)\le\tau_f(\Phi_0(p))<\tau.$$

In this case q_1 is a 3-point.

$$u=x^ay^bz^c, v=x^dy^ez^f, w=\sum_{i\ge 0}\alpha_ix^{a_i}y^{b_i}z^{c_i}+x^gy^hz^i$$

with $0\ne\alpha_i$ for all i. Set

$$\gamma=\sum\alpha_ix^{a_i-a_0}y^{b_i-b_0}z^{c_i-c_0}+x^{g-a_0}y^{h-a_0}z^{i-a_0}.$$

$\gamma\in\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ is a unit series, and

$$w=x^{a_0}y^{b_0}z^{c_0}\gamma,$$

with $(a_0,b_0,c_0)<(a,b,c)$.

Suppose that (a,b,c) and (a_0,b_0,c_0) are linearly independent.

After possibly interchanging x,y,z, we may assume that $a_0b-ab_0\ne 0$. There exist $\lambda_1,\lambda_2\in\mathbf{Q}$ such that if

$$x=\overline{x}\gamma^{\lambda_1}, y=\overline{y}\gamma^{\lambda_2}, \tag{139}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} w &= \overline{x}^{a_0}\overline{y}^{b_0}z^{c_0} \\ u &= \overline{x}^a\overline{y}^bz^c \\ v &= \overline{x}^d\overline{y}^ez^f\gamma^\lambda \end{aligned}$$

for some $0\ne\lambda\in\mathbf{Q}$.

There exists a series $P(x,y,z)$ where the monomials in x,y,z in P with nonzero coefficients are monomials in $x^{a_i-a_0}y^{b_i-b_0}z^{c_i-c_0}$ for $i\ge 0$, such that

$$\gamma^{\lambda}=P+x^{g-a_0}y^{h-b_0}z^{i-c_0}\Omega. \tag{140}$$

Iterating, by substituting (139) into successive iterations of (140), we see that there exists a series $\overline{P}(\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{z})$, where the monomials in $\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{z}$ in $\overline{P}$ with nonzero coefficients are monomials in $\overline{x}^{a_i-a_0}\overline{y}^{b_i-b_0}\overline{z}^{c_i-c_0}$ for $i\ge 0$ such that

$$\gamma^{\lambda}=\overline{P}+\overline{x}^{g-a_0}\overline{y}^{h-b_0}z^{i-c_0}\overline{\Omega}.$$

Comparing the Jacobian determinants

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\begin{array}{c}\frac{\partial(u,v,w)}{\partial(x,y,z)}\end{array}\right)$$

and

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\begin{array}{c}\frac{\partial(w,u,v)}{\partial(\overline{x},\overline{y},z)}\end{array}\right),$$

we see that $\overline{\Omega}$ is a unit series.

There exist rational numbers β_1,β_2,β_3 such that we can make a formal change of variables, setting

$$\tilde{x}=\overline{x}\overline{\Omega}^{\beta_1},\tilde{y}=\overline{y}\overline{\Omega}^{\beta_2},\tilde{z}=z\overline{\Omega}^{\beta_3}$$

to get an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll}
w & =\tilde{x}^{a_0}\tilde{y}^{b_0}\tilde{c}^{c_0}\\
u & =\tilde{x}^{a}\tilde{y}^{b}\tilde{z}^{c}\\
v & =\tilde{x}^{d}\tilde{y}^{e}\tilde{z}^{f}\left(\overline{P}(\tilde{x},\tilde{y},\tilde{z})+\tilde{x}^{g-a_0}\tilde{y}^{h-b_0}\tilde{z}^{i-c_0}\right).
\end{array}$$

Thus

$$\begin{array}{ll}
w_1 & =\tilde{x}^{a_0}\tilde{y}^{b_0}\tilde{c}^{c_0}\\
u_1 & =\tilde{x}^{a-a_0}\tilde{y}^{b-b_0}\tilde{z}^{c-c_0}\\
v & =\tilde{x}^{d}\tilde{y}^{e}\tilde{z}^{f}\left(\overline{P}(\tilde{x},\tilde{y},\tilde{z})+\tilde{x}^{g-a_0}\tilde{y}^{h-b_0}\tilde{z}^{i-c_0}\right).
\end{array}$$

is an expression of the form of (19).

We see that $\overline{f}_0$ is prepared at p, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_{\overline{f}_0}(p) &\le \ell(((a_0,b_0,c_0)\mathbf{Z}+(a-a_0,b-b_0,c-c_0)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+\textstyle\sum_{i\ge 1}(a_i-a_0,b_i-b_0,c_i-c_0)\mathbf{Z})\\
&\quad /((a_0,b_0,c_0)+(a-a_0,b-b_0,c-c_0)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}))\\
&=\ell(((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+\textstyle\sum_{i\ge 0}(a_i,b_i,c_i)\mathbf{Z})\\
&\quad /((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+(a_0,b_0,c_0)\mathbf{Z}))\\
&\le \ell(((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+\textstyle\sum_{i\ge 0}(a_i,b_i,c_i)\mathbf{Z})\\
&\quad /((a,b,c)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}))\\
&=\tau_{f\circ\Phi_0}(p)\le\tau_f(\Phi_0(p)).
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose that (a,b,c) and (a_0,b_0,c_0) are linearly dependent.

Then (d,e,f) and (a_0,b_0,c_0) are linearly independent. After possibly interchanging x,y,z, we may assume that $db_0-ea_0\ne 0$. There exist $\lambda_1,\lambda_2\in\mathbf{Q}$ such that if

$$x=\overline{x}\gamma^{\lambda_1},y=\overline{y}\gamma^{\lambda_2},$$

then

$$\begin{array}{ll}
w & =\overline{x}^{a_0}\overline{y}^{b_0}z^{c_0}\\
v & =\overline{x}^{d}\overline{y}^{e}z^{f}\\
u & =\overline{x}^{a}\overline{y}^{b}z^{c}\gamma^{\lambda}
\end{array}$$

for some $0\ne\lambda\in\mathbf{Q}$.

As in the case when (a,b,c) and (a_0,b_0,c_0) are linearly independent, we can make a change of variables to get an expression where the monomials in $\tilde{x},\tilde{y},\tilde{z}$ in $\tilde{P}$ with nonzero coefficients are monomials in $\tilde{x}^{a_i-a_0}\tilde{y}^{\tilde{b}_i-b_0}\tilde{z}^{c_i-c_0}$ for $i\ge 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} w &= \tilde{x}^{a_0}\tilde{y}^{b_0}\tilde{c}^{c_0}\\ v &= \tilde{x}^{d}\tilde{y}^{e}\tilde{z}^{f}\\ u &= \tilde{x}^{a}\tilde{y}^{b}\tilde{z}^{c}\left(\overline{P}(\tilde{x},\tilde{y},\tilde{z})+\tilde{x}^{g-a_0}\tilde{y}^{h-b_0}\tilde{z}^{i-c_0}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= \tilde{x}^{a_0}\tilde{y}^{b_0}\tilde{c}^{c_0}\\ v &= \tilde{x}^{d}\tilde{y}^{e}\tilde{z}^{f}\\ u_1 &= \tilde{x}^{a-a_0}\tilde{y}^{b-b_0}\tilde{z}^{c-c_0}\left(\overline{P}(\tilde{x},\tilde{y},\tilde{z})+\tilde{x}^{g-a_0}\tilde{y}^{h-b_0}\tilde{z}^{i-c_0}\right).\end{aligned}$$

is an expression of the form of (19).

We see that $\overline{f}_0$ is prepared at p, and

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{\overline{f}_0}(p) &\le \ell(((a_0,b_0,c_0)\mathbf{Z}+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+(a-a_0,b-b_0,c-c_0)\mathbf{Z}+\textstyle\sum_{i\ge1}(a_i-a_0,b_i-b_0,c_i-c_0)\mathbf{Z})\\ &\quad /((a_0,b_0,c_0)+(d,e,f)\mathbf{Z}+(a-a_0,b-b_0,c-c_0)\mathbf{Z}))\\ &\le \tau_{f\circ\Phi_0}(p)\le\tau_f(\Phi_0(p)).\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\overline{f}_0:U_0\rightarrow Y_1$ is τ-prepared, and $\tau_{\overline{f}_0}(p)\le\tau_f(\Phi_0(p))$ for $p\in U_0$. Thus $\overline{f}_0$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared), as $C\cap U(R)=\emptyset$.

Let $Z_0=X_0$.

We now construct a sequence of morphisms $\Lambda_i:Z_i\rightarrow Z_{i-1}$ which are the blow up of a possible curve C_{i-1} contained in the locus where $\mathcal{I}_C\mathcal{O}_{Z_{i-1}}$ is not invertible.

Let $h_i:Z_i\rightarrow Y_1$ be the rational map $h_i=\overline{f}_0\circ\Lambda_1\circ\cdots\circ\Lambda_i$. We will verify by induction that:

A. For all p_1 in the locus where h_i is a morphism, h_i is τ-prepared and

$$\tau_{h_i}(p_1)\le\tau_f(\Phi_0\circ\Lambda_1\circ\Lambda_2\circ\cdots\circ\Lambda_i(p_1)).$$

B. Suppose that $p_1\in Z_i$ is a point where $\mathcal{I}_C\mathcal{O}_{Z_i,p_1}$ is not principal. Let $p=\Lambda_1\circ\cdots\circ\Lambda_i(p_1)$, $q=f\circ\Phi_0(p)$. Then there exist permissible parameters u,v,w at q, permissible parameters x,y,z in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Z_0,p}$ for u,v and regular parameters x_1,y_1,z_1 in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Z_i,p_1}$ such that we have one of the following forms:

   1. q a 1-point, p a 1-point, p_1 a 1-point. We have an expression

   $$u=x^a,v=z,w=\sum_{i<n,a_{ij}\ne0}a_{ij}x^iz^j+x^n(y+\beta)$$

   in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Z_0,p}$, where $u=v=0$ are local equations of C.

   We have permissible parameters x_1,y_1,z_1 at p_1 such that

   $$x=x_1,y=y_1,z=x_1^bz_1$$

   with $b<a$, and

   $$\begin{aligned} u &= x_1^a\\ v &= x_1^bz_1\\ w &= \textstyle\sum a_{ij}x_1^{i+bj}z_1^j+x_1^n(y_1+\beta).\end{aligned}\tag{141}$$

   with $b<a$, where $u=v=0$ are local equations of C.

   2. q a 1-point, p a 2-point. We have an expression

   $$u=(x^ay^b)^k,v=z,w=\sum_{i,l\ge0}a_{il}z^l(x^ay^b)^i+x^ey^f$$

in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Z_0,p}$, where the sum is over i,l such that $(ia,ib)\not\geq(e,f)$, $af-eb\neq 0$ and $u=v=0$ are local equations of C.

We have permissible parameters x_1,y_1,z_1 at p_1 such that

$$x=x_1, y=y_1, z=x_1^cy_1^dz_1$$

with $(c,d)<(ak,bk)$, and

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & =(x_1^ay_1^b)^k\\ v & =x_1^cy_1^dz_1\\ w & =\sum_{i,l}a_{il}z_1^lx_1^{ai+cl}y_1^{bi+dl}+x_1^ey_1^f. \end{array} \tag{142}$$

with $(c,d)<(ak,bk)$, $u=v=0$ are local equations of C.

3. q a 2-point, p a 1-point, p_1 a 1-point. We have an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & =x_1^a\\ v & =x_1^b(\beta+y_1)\\ w & =x_1^dz_1 \end{array} \tag{143}$$

in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Z_i,p_i}$, with $d<a$, $u=w=0$ a local equation of C

4. q a 2-point, p a 2-point, p_1 a 2-point. We have an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & =x_1^ay_1^b\\ v & =x_1^cy_1^d\\ w & =x_1^gy_1^hz_1 \end{array} \tag{144}$$

with $(g,h)<(a,b)$, $u=w=0$ are local equation of C.

We have verified that A and B are true for $h_0=\overline{f}_0$. Suppose that A and B are true for h_i. We will verify that A and B are true for h_{i+1}.

We may suppose that $p_1\in C_i$ (recall that C_i is the curve blown up by Λ_{i+1}). Then C_i has local equations $x_1=z_1=0$ if p_1 satisfies (141). C_i has local equations $x_1=z_1=0$ (or $y_1=z_1=0$) in (142). C_i has local equations $x_1=z_1=0$ in (143). C_i has local equations $x_1=z_1=0$ (or $y_1=z_1=0$) in (144).

After possibly interchanging x_1 and y_1, we may assume that $x_1=z_1=0$ is a local equation of C_i.

Suppose that $p_2\in\Lambda_{i+1}^{-1}(p_1)$. Then $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Z_{i+1},p_2}$ has regular parameters x_2,y_2,z_2 such that

$$x_1=x_2, y_1=y_2, z_1=x_2(z_2+\alpha) \tag{145}$$

with $\alpha\in\mathbf{k}$, or

$$x_1=x_2z_2, y_1=y_2, z_1=z_2. \tag{146}$$

Suppose that (141) holds. Then

$$\tau_{f\circ\Phi_0}(p)=\ell\left([\sum_{a_{ij}\neq 0}i\mathbf{Z}+a\mathbf{Z}]/a\mathbf{Z}\right).$$

Suppose that (141) and (145) hold. Then

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & =x_2^a\\ v & =x_2^{b+1}(z_2+\alpha)\\ w & =\sum a_{ij}x_2^{i+(b+1)j}(z_2+\alpha)^j+x_2^n(y_2+\beta). \end{array} \tag{147}$$

Suppose that $a = b+1$ in (147). Then $Z_{i+1} \rightarrow Y_1$ is a morphism at p_2. Let $q_1 = h_{i+1}(p_2)$. There exist permissible parameters u_1, v_1, w at q_1 defined by

$$u = u_1, v = u_1(v_1 + \alpha).$$

We have an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_1 & = x_2^a \\ v_1 & = z_2 \\ w & = \sum a_{ij} x_2^{i+aj}(z_2+\alpha)^j + x_2^n(y_2+\beta), \end{array} \tag{148}$$

of type (6) so that h_{i+1} is prepared at p_2. We have by (29) that

$$\tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2) \le \ell((a\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{a_{ij}\ne 0}[i+a]\mathbf{Z})/a\mathbf{Z}) = \tau_{f\circ\Phi_0}(p) \le \tau_f(\Phi_0(p)).$$

Suppose that $b+1 < a$ and $\alpha \ne 0$ in (147). Then $Z_{i+1} \rightarrow Y_1$ is a morphism at p_2. Let $q_1 = h_{i+1}(p_2)$. There exist permissible parameters u_1, v_1, w at q_1 defined by

$$u = u_1 v_1, v = v_1.$$

There exist regular parameters $\overline{x}_2, \overline{y}_2, \overline{z}_2$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Z_{i+1},p_2}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_1 & = x_2^{a-b-1}(z_2+\alpha)^{-1} = \overline{x}_2^{a-b-1} \\ v_1 & = x_2^{b+1}(z_2+\alpha) = \overline{x}_2^{b+1}(\overline{z}_2+\overline{\alpha}) \\ w & = \sum_s x_2^s(\sum_{i+(b+1)j=s} a_{ij}(z_2+\alpha)^j) + x_2^n(y_2+\beta) \\ & = \sum_s \overline{x}_2^s(\overline{z}_2+\alpha)^{\frac{s}{a}}\left[\sum_j a_{ij}(\overline{z}_2+\alpha)^{j(\frac{a-b-1}{a})}\right] + \overline{x}_2^n(\overline{y}_2+\overline{\beta}). \end{array} \tag{149}$$

of type (2), so that h_{i+1} is prepared at p_2.

We observe that

$$\sum_{i+(b+1)j=s} a_{ij}(z_2+\alpha)^j \ne 0$$

if and only if some $a_{ij} \ne 0$ with $i+(b+1)j = s$. To show this, observe that

$$x^s[\sum_{i+(b+1)j=s} a_{ij}\left(\frac{y}{x^{b+1}}\right)^j] = \sum_{i+(b+1)j=s} a_{ij}x^iy^j.$$

We calculate from (27),

$$\begin{array}{rl} \tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2) & = \ell([(a-b-1)\mathbf{Z} + (b+1)\mathbf{Z} \\ & \quad + \sum_{a_{ij}\ne 0, i+(b+1)j\not\ge n}(i+(b+1)j)\mathbf{Z}]/[(a-b-1)\mathbf{Z} + (b+1)\mathbf{Z}]) \\ & \le \ell\left([\sum_{a_{ij}\ne 0} i\mathbf{Z} + a\mathbf{Z} + (b+1)\mathbf{Z}]/[a\mathbf{Z} + (b+1)\mathbf{Z}]\right) \\ & \le \tau_{f\circ\Phi_0}(p) \le \tau_f(\Phi_0(p)) \end{array}$$

Suppose that $b+1 < a$, $0 = \alpha$ in (147). Then we are back in the form (141) with a decrease in $a-b$.

Suppose that (141) and (146) hold. Then

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = x_2^a z_2^a \\ v & = x_2^b z_2^{b+1} \\ w & = \sum a_{ij} x_2^{i+bj} z_2^{i+(b+1)j} + x_2^n z_2^n(y_2+\beta). \end{array}$$

$Z_{i+1} \rightarrow Y_1$ is a morphism at p_2. Let $q_1 = h_{i+1}(p_2)$. There exist permissible parameters u_1, v_1, w at q_1 defined by

$$u = u_1 v_1, v = v_1.$$

We have an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_1 & = x_2^{a-b}z_2^{a-b-1}\\ v_1 & = x_2^bz_2^{b+1}\\ w & = \sum a_{ij}x_2^{i+bj}z_2^{i+(b+1)j} + x_2^nz_2^n(y_2+\beta) \end{array} \tag{150}$$

of type (3), so that h_{i+1} is prepared at p_2.

From (21), we have

$$\begin{array}{ll} \tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2) & = \ell(((a-b,a-b-1)\mathbf{Z}+(b,b+1)\mathbf{Z}\\ & \quad +\sum_{a_{ij}\neq 0,(i+bj,i+(b+1)j)\not\geq(n,n)}(i+bj,i+(b+1)j)\mathbf{Z})\\ & \quad /((a-b,a-b-1)\mathbf{Z}+(b,b+1)\mathbf{Z}))\\ & \le \ell(((a,a)\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{a_{ij}\neq 0}(i,i)\mathbf{Z})/(a,a)\mathbf{Z})\\ & = \tau_{f\circ\Phi_0}(p)\le\tau_f(\Phi_0(p)). \end{array}$$

Suppose that (142) holds. Then

$$\tau_{f\circ\Phi_0}(p) = \ell\left[(k\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{a_{il}\neq 0} i\mathbf{Z})/k\mathbf{Z}\right].$$

Suppose that (142) and (145) hold. Then we have

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = (x_2^ay_2^b)^k\\ v & = x_2^{c+1}y_2^d(z_2+\alpha)\\ w & = \sum_{i,l}a_{il}(z_2+\alpha)^lx_2^{ai+(c+1)l}y_2^{bi+dl}+x_2^ey_2^f. \end{array} \tag{151}$$

Suppose that $(ak,bk)=(c+1,d)$ in (151). Then $Z_{i+1}\rightarrow Y_1$ is a morphism at p_2. Let $q_1=h_{i+1}(p_2)$. There exist permissible parameters u_1,v_1,w at q_1 defined by

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = u_1\\ v & = u_1(v_1+\alpha). \end{array}$$

We have an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_1 & = (x_2^ay_2^b)^k\\ v_1 & = z_2\\ w & = \sum_{i,l}a_{il}(z_2+\alpha)^lx_2^{ai+(c+1)l}y_2^{bi+dl}+x_2^ey_2^f\\ & = \sum_{i,l}a_{il}(z_2+\alpha)^l(x_2^ay_2^b)^{i+lk}+x_2^ey_2^f \end{array} \tag{152}$$

of type (7), so that h_{i+1} is prepared at p_2. From (24), we have

$$\tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2)\le\ell((k\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{a_{il}\neq 0,(i+lk)(a,b)\not\geq(e,f)}(i+lk)\mathbf{Z}/k\mathbf{Z})\le\tau_{f\circ\Phi_0}(p)\le\tau_f(\Phi_0(p)).$$

Suppose that $(ak,bk)>(c+1,d)$ and $0\neq\alpha$ in (151). Then $Z_{i+1}\rightarrow Y_1$ is a morphism at p_2. Let $q_1=h_{i+1}(p_2)$. There exist permissible parameters u_1,v_1,w at q_1 defined by

$$u=u_1v_1, v=v_1.$$

Suppose that $ad-b(c+1)\neq 0$ in (151). Then there exist regular parameters $\overline{x}_2,\overline{y}_2,\overline{z}_2$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Z_{i+1},p_2}$ defined by

$$\begin{array}{ll} \overline{x}_2 & = x_2(z_2+\alpha)^{-\frac{bk}{\overline{h}}}\\ \overline{y}_2 & = y_2(z_2+\alpha)^{\frac{ak}{\overline{h}}}\\ \overline{z}_2 & = (z_2+\alpha)^{\frac{ebk-fak}{\overline{h}}}-\overline{\alpha} \end{array}$$

with $\overline{h} = adk-(c+1)bk$ and $\overline{\alpha} = \alpha^{\frac{ebk-fak}{\overline{h}}}$, such that

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_1 & = x_2^{ak-c-1}y_2^{bk-d}(z_2+\alpha)^{-1} = \overline{x}_2^{ak-c-1}\overline{y}_2^{bk-d}\\ v_1 & = x_2^{c+1}y_2^d(z_2+\alpha) = \overline{x}_2^{c+1}\overline{y}_2^d\\ w & = \sum_{i,l} a_{il}\overline{x}_2^{ai+(c+1)l}\overline{y}_2^{bi+dl} + \overline{x}_2^e\overline{y}_2^f(\overline{z}_2+\overline{\alpha})\end{array} \tag{153}$$

with $0 \ne \overline{\alpha} \in \mathbf{k}$, which is an expression of type (3), so that h_{i+1} is prepared at p_2. From (21), we see that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2) & = \ell((ak-c-1,bk-d)\mathbf{Z} + (c+1,d)\mathbf{Z}\\ & \quad + \sum_{a_{il}\ne 0, i(a,b)+l(c+1,d)\not\ge(e,f)}[i(a,b)+l(c+1,d)]\mathbf{Z}]/\\ & \quad [(ak-c-1,bk-d)\mathbf{Z}+(c+1,d)\mathbf{Z})\\ & \le \ell\left[(k(a,b)\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{a_{il}\ne 0} i(a,b)\mathbf{Z})/k(a,b)\mathbf{Z}\right]\\ & = \ell\left[k\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{a_{il}\ne 0} i\mathbf{Z}/k\mathbf{Z}\right] = \tau_{f\circ\Phi_0}(p) \le \tau_f(\Phi_0(p)).\end{array} \tag{154}$$

Suppose that $ad-b(c+1) = 0$ in (151), (and $(ak,bk) > (c+1,d)$, $0 \ne \alpha$ in (151)). There exist positive integers $\overline{a}, \overline{b}, \overline{t}, \overline{k}$ such that $\gcd(\overline{a},\overline{b}) = 1$, and

$$(ak-c-1,bk-d) = \overline{t}(\overline{a},\overline{b}),\ \ (c+1,d) = \overline{k}(\overline{a},\overline{b}).$$

From $k(a,b) = (\overline{t}+\overline{k})(\overline{a},\overline{b})$ and $\gcd(a,b) = 1$, $\gcd(\overline{a},\overline{b}) = 1$, we see that $(a,b) = (\overline{a},\overline{b})$ and $\overline{t}+\overline{k} = k$.

There exist regular parameters $\overline{x}_2, \overline{y}_2, \overline{z}_2$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Z_{i+1},p_2}$, defined by

$$\begin{array}{ll} \overline{x}_2 & = x_2(z_2+\alpha)^{-\frac{f}{\overline{h}\overline{t}}}\\ \overline{y}_2 & = y_2(z_2+\alpha)^{\frac{e}{\overline{h}\overline{t}}}\\ \overline{z}_2 & = (z_2+\alpha)^{1+\frac{\overline{k}}{\overline{t}}} - \overline{\alpha}\end{array}$$

where $\overline{h} = fa-eb$, $\overline{\alpha} = e^{1+\frac{\overline{k}}{\overline{t}}}$, such that

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_1 & = x_2^{ak-c-1}y_2^{bk-d}(z_2+\alpha)^{-1} = (\overline{x}_2^a\overline{y}_2^b)^{\overline{t}}\\ v_1 & = x_2^{c+1}y_2^d(z_2+\alpha) = (\overline{x}_2^a\overline{y}_2^b)^{\overline{k}}(\overline{z}_2+\overline{\alpha})\\ w & = \sum_{i,l} a_{il}(\overline{z}_2+\overline{\alpha})^{(\frac{\overline{t}}{k}+1)l+\frac{i}{k}}(\overline{x}_2^a\overline{y}_2^b)^{i+kl} + \overline{x}_2^e\overline{y}_2^f,\end{array} \tag{155}$$

which is an expression of type (4), so that h_{i+1} is prepared at p_2.

From (22), we have

$$\begin{array}{ll} \tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2) & = \ell((\overline{t}\mathbf{Z} + \overline{k}\mathbf{Z} + \sum_{a_{il}\ne 0,(i+kl)(a,b)\not\ge(e,f)}(lk+i)\mathbf{Z})/(\overline{t}\mathbf{Z}+\overline{k}\mathbf{Z}))\\ & \le \ell((k\mathbf{Z}+\overline{k}\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{a_{il}\ne 0} i\mathbf{Z})/(k\mathbf{Z}+\overline{k}\mathbf{Z}))\\ & \le \ell((k\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{a_{il}\ne 0} i\mathbf{Z})/k\mathbf{Z})\\ & = \tau_{f\circ\Phi_0}(p) \le \tau_f(\Phi_0(p))\end{array} \tag{156}$$

Suppose that $(ak,bk) > (c+1,d)$ and $0 = \alpha$ in (151). Then we are back in the form (142), with a decrease in $(ak-c)+(bk-d)$.

Suppose that (142) and (146) hold. Then

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = x_2^{ak}y_2^{bk}z_2^{ak}\\ v & = x_2^cy_2^dz_2^{c+1}\\ w & = \sum_{i,l} a_{il}x_2^{ai+cl}y_2^{bi+dl}z_2^{l+ai+cl} + x_2^ey_2^fz_2^e.\end{array} \tag{157}$$

Then $Z_{i+1} \to Y_1$ is a morphism at p_2. Let $q_1 = h_{i+1}(p_2)$. There exist permissible parameters u_1, v_1, w at q_1 defined by

$$u = u_1v_1, v = v_1.$$

We have an expression

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &= x_2^{ak-c}y_2^{bk-d}z_2^{ak-c-1}\\ v_1 &= x_2^{c}y_2^{d}z_2^{c+1}\\ w &= \textstyle\sum_{i,l} a_{il}x_2^{ai+cl}y_2^{bi+dl}z_2^{l+ai+cl}+x_2^{e}y_2^{f}z_2^{e}. \end{aligned} \tag{158}$$

of type (5), so that h_{i+1} is prepared at p_2. We calculate $\tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2)$ from (19).

Set

$$\begin{aligned} H &= ((ak,bk,ak)\mathbf{Z}+(c,d,c+1)\mathbf{Z}\\ &\quad+\textstyle\sum_{a_{il}\neq 0}(ai+cl,bi+dl,l+ai+cl)\mathbf{Z})/\\ &\quad((ak,bk,ak)\mathbf{Z}+(c,d,c+1)\mathbf{Z})\\ &\quad\cong((ak,bk,ak)\mathbf{Z}+\textstyle\sum_{a_{il}\neq 0}(ai,bi,ai)\mathbf{Z})/(ak,bk,ak)\mathbf{Z}). \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2) &= \ell((ak-c,bk-d,ak-c-1)\mathbf{Z}+(c,d,c+1)\mathbf{Z}\\ &\quad+\textstyle\sum_{a_{il}\neq 0,(ai+cl,bi+dl,l+ai+cl)\not>(e,f,e)}(ai+cl,bi+dl,l+ai+cl)\mathbf{Z})/\\ &\quad((ak-c,bk-d,ak-c-1)\mathbf{Z}+(c,d,c+1)\mathbf{Z}))\\ &\quad\leq \ell(H). \end{aligned}$$

The homomorphism $\mathbf{Z}\rightarrow\mathbf{Z}^3$ defined by $x\mapsto(xa,xb,xa)$ induces an isomorphism

$$(k\mathbf{Z}+\sum_{a_{il}\neq 0}i\mathbf{Z})/k\mathbf{Z}\rightarrow H. \tag{159}$$

Thus $\tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2)\leq\tau_{f\circ\Phi_0}(p)\leq\tau_f(\Phi_0(p))$.

Suppose that (143) and (145) hold. Then

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x_2^{a}\\ v &= x_2^{b}(\beta+y_2)\\ w &= x_2^{d+1}(z_2+\alpha). \end{aligned} \tag{160}$$

Suppose that $d+1=a$ in (160). Then $Z_{i+1}\rightarrow Y_1$ is a morphism at p_2. Let $q_1=h_{i+1}(p_2)$. There exist permissible parameters u_1,v,w_1 at q_1 defined by

$$u=u_1, w=u_1(w_1+\alpha).$$

We have an expression

$$u_1=x_2^{a}, v=x_2^{b}(\beta+y_2), w_1=z_2$$

which is toroidal, so that h_{i+1} is prepared at p_2, and

$$\tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2)=-\infty\leq\tau_f(\Phi_0(p)).$$

Suppose that $d+1<a$ and $0\neq\alpha$ in (160). Then $Z_{i+1}\rightarrow Y_1$ is a morphism at p_2. Let $q_1=h_{i+1}(p_1)$. There exist permissible parameters u_1,v,w_1 at q_1 defined by

$$u=u_1w_1, w=w_1,$$

so that q_1 is a 3-point.

There exist regular parameters $\overline{x}_2,\overline{y}_2,\overline{z}_2$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Z_{i+1},p_2}$ and $0\neq\overline{\alpha},\overline{\beta}\in\mathbf{k}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &= x_2^{a-d-1}(z_2+\alpha)^{-1}=\overline{x}_2^{a-d-1}\\ v &= \overline{x}_2^{b}(\overline{\beta}+\overline{y}_2)\\ w_1 &= \overline{x}_2^{d+1}(\overline{z}_2+\overline{\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

which is toroidal, so that h_{i+1} is prepared at p_2, and

$$\tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2)=-\infty\leq\tau_f(\Phi_0(p)).$$

Suppose that $d+1<a$ and $0=\alpha$ in (160). Then we are back in the form (143) with a decrease in $a-d$.

Suppose that (143) and (146) hold. Then

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = x_2^az_2^a\\ v & = x_2^bz_2^b(\alpha+y_2)\\ w & = x_2^dz_2^{d+1}. \end{array}$$

Thus $Z_{i+1}\rightarrow Y_1$ is a morphism at p_2. Let $q_1=h_{i+1}(p_2)$. There exist permissible parameters u_1,v,w_1 at q_1 defined by

$$u=u_1w_1, w=w_1.$$

We have a 2-point mapping to a 3-point, and an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_1 & = x_2^{a-d}z_2^{a-d-1}\\ v & = x_2^bz_2^b(\alpha+y_2)\\ w_1 & = x_2^dz_2^{d+1} \end{array}$$

which is a toroidal form, so that h_{i+1} is prepared at p_2, and

$$\tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2)=-\infty\le\tau_f(\Phi_0(p)).$$

Suppose that (144) and (145) hold. Then

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = x_2^ay_2^b\\ v & = x_2^cy_2^d\\ w & = x_2^{g+1}y_2^h(z_2+\alpha). \end{array}\tag{161}$$

Suppose that $(a,b)=(g+1,h)$ in (161). Then $Z_{i+1}\rightarrow Y_1$ is a morphism at p_2. Let $q_1=h_{i+1}(p_2)$. There exist permissible parameters u_1,v,w_1 at q_1 defined by

$$u=u_1, w=u_1(w_1+\alpha).$$

We have an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_1 & = x_2^ay_2^b\\ v & = x_2^cy_2^d\\ w_1 & = z_2 \end{array}$$

which is toroidal, so that h_{i+1} is prepared at p_2, and

$$\tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2)=-\infty\le\tau_f(\Phi_0(p)).$$

Suppose that $(g+1,h)<(a,b)$ and $0\ne\alpha$ in (161). Then $Z_{i+1}\rightarrow Y_1$ is a morphism at p_2. Let $q_1=h_{i+1}(p_2)$. There exist permissible parameters u_1,v,w_1 at q_1 defined by

$$u=u_1w_1, w=w_1.$$

We have an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_1 & = x_2^{a-g-1}y_2^{b-h}(z_2+\alpha)^{-1}\\ v & = x_2^cy_2^d\\ w_1 & = x_2^{g+1}y_2^h(z_2+\alpha) \end{array}$$

which is toroidal after a change of variable in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Z_{i+1},p_2}$, so that h_{i+1} is prepared at p_2, and

$$\tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2)=-\infty\le\tau_f(\Phi_0(p)).$$

Suppose that $(g+1,h)<(a,b)$ and $\alpha=0$ in (161). Then we are back in the form (144), with a decrease in $(a-g)+(b-h)$.

Suppose that (144) and (146) hold. Then

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = x_2^ay_2^bz_2^a\\ v & = x_2^cy_2^dz_2^c\\ w & = x_2^gy_2^hz_2^{g+1}. \end{array}$$

Thus $Z_{i+1}\rightarrow Y_1$ is a morphism at p_2. Let $q_1=h_{i+1}(p_2)$. There exist permissible parameters u_1,v,w_1 at q_1 defined by

$$u=u_1w_1, w=w_1.$$

We have a 3-point mapping to a 3-point, and an expression

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_1 & = x_2^{a-g}y_2^{b-h}z_2^{a-g-1}\\ v & = x_2^cy_2^dz_2^c\\ w_1 & = x_2^gy_2^hz_2^{g+1} \end{array}$$

which is toroidal, so that h_{i+1} is prepared at p_2, and

$$\tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2)=-\infty\le\tau_f(\Phi_0(p)).$$

We have thus verified A and B for all h_i.

Suppose that $p\in Z_i$ is in the locus Σ_i where $\mathcal{I}_C\mathcal{O}_{Z_i}$ is not locally principal. Define

$$C(p)=\left\{\begin{array}{ll} a-b & \text{if (141) holds at } p\\ ak-c+bk-d & \text{if (142) holds at } p\\ a-d & \text{if (143) holds at } p\\ a-g+b-h & \text{if (144) holds at } p. \end{array}\right.$$

Let

$$C(Z_i)=\max\{C(p)\mid p\in\Sigma_i\}.$$

We have shown in the above analysis that

$$0\le C(Z_{i+1})<C(Z_i)$$

if the rational map h_i is not a morphism. Thus there exists a finite n such that $f_1=h_n$, $\Phi_1=\Phi_0\circ\Lambda_1\circ\cdots\circ\Lambda_n$, $X_1=Z_n$ satisfy 1 - 4 of the conclusions of Lemma 8.4.

We now prove 5. If $p\in f^{-1}(q)$, then we have permissible parameters x,y,z for u,v,w in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ such that there is one of the forms:

p a 1-point

$$u=x^a, v=y, w=g(x,y)+x^n(z+\beta) \tag{162}$$

or p a 2-point

$$u=(x^ay^b)^k, v=z, w=h(x^ay^b,z)+x^cy^d. \tag{163}$$

We further have that $u=v=0$ are local equations of C.

Since q_1 is a 1-point, at q_1 we have permissible parameters u_1,v_1,w_1 defined by

$$u=u_1, v=u_1(v_1+\alpha), w=w_1$$

for some $\alpha\in\mathbf{k}$. Since C_1 is a section over C, there exists a series $\lambda(v_1,w)$ such that $u_1=\lambda(v_1,w_1)=0$ are local equations of C_1 (in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y_1,q_1}$), and

$$\mathbf{k}[[u,v,w]]/(u,v)\rightarrow\mathbf{k}[[u_1,v_1,w]]/(u_1,\lambda)$$

is an isomorphism, which implies that $\lambda=(v_1-\phi(w))\gamma$ where ϕ is a series and γ is a unit series in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y_1,q_1}$. Set

$$\overline{u}_1=u_1, \overline{v}_1=v_1-\phi(w).$$

$\overline{u}_1, \overline{v}_1, w$ are permissible parameters at q_1, and $\overline{u}_1 = \overline{v}_1 = 0$ are local equations of C_1 at q_1.

Suppose that $p_1 \in f_1^{-1}(q_1)$. First suppose that $p = \Phi_1(p_1)$ has the form (162). Then $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_1,p_1}$ has regular parameters x_1, y_1, z_1 with $x = x_1, y = x_1^a(y_1 + \alpha)$, since $X_0 \rightarrow X$ is an isomorphism over p. p_1 is a 1-point, and substituting into (162), we have

$$u_1 = x_1^a, v_1 = y_1, w = g(x_1, x_1^a(y_1 + \alpha)) + x_1^n(z + \beta)$$

and thus $\overline{u}_1, \overline{v}_1$ are toroidal forms at p_1.

Now suppose that $p = \Phi_1(p_1)$ has the form (163).

Let

$$p' = \Lambda_1 \circ \cdots \circ \Lambda_n(p) \in X_0.$$

There exist regular parameters x_1, y_1, z_1 in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_1,p'}$ such that

$$x = x_1^{\overline{a}} y_1^{\overline{b}}, y = x_1^{\overline{c}} y_1^{\overline{d}}, z = z_1 \tag{164}$$

or

$$x = x_1^{\overline{a}}(y_1 + \alpha)^{\overline{b}}, y = x_1^{\overline{c}}(y_1 + \overline{\alpha})^{\overline{d}}, z = z_1 \tag{165}$$

with $0 \neq \alpha \in \mathbf{k}$. If (164) holds, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} u &= (x_1^{a'} y_1^{b'})^k \\ v &= z_1 \\ w &= h(x_1^{a'} y_1^{b'}, z) + x_1^{c'} y_1^{d'} \end{aligned} \tag{166}$$

with $0 \neq \alpha \in \mathbf{k}$.

If (165) holds, then we have $0 \neq \alpha' \in \mathbf{k}$ and permissible parameters $\overline{x}_1, \overline{y}_1, z_1$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_1,p'}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \overline{x}_1^{a'k} \\ v &= z_1 \\ w &= h(\overline{x}_1^{a'}, z_1) + \overline{x}_1^{b'}(\overline{y}_1 + \alpha'). \end{aligned} \tag{167}$$

Suppose that a form (166) holds at p'. Then $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_1,p_1}$ has regular parameters x_2, y_2, z_2 with

$$x_1 = x_2, y_1 = y_2, z_1 = x_2^{a'k} y_2^{b'k}(z_2 + \alpha).$$

p_1 is a 2-point, and substituting into (166), we have

$$u_1 = (x_2^{a'} y_2^{b'})^k, v_1 = z_2, w = h(x_2^{a'} y_2^{b'}, x_2^{a'k} y_2^{b'k}(z_2 + \alpha)) + x_2^{c'} y_2^{d'}.$$

Thus $\overline{u}_1, \overline{v}_1$ are toroidal forms at p_1.

Suppose that a form (167) holds at p'. Then $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_1,p_1}$ has regular parameters x_2, y_2, z_2 with

$$\overline{x}_1 = x_2, \overline{y}_1 = y_2, z_1 = x_2^{a'k}(z_2 + \alpha).$$

p_1 is a 1-point, and substituting into (167), we have

$$u_1 = x_2^{a'k}, v_1 = z_2, w = h(x_2^{a'}, x_2^{a'k}(z_2 + \alpha)) + x_2^{c'} y_2^{d'}.$$

Thus $\overline{u}_1, \overline{v}_1$ are toroidal forms at p_1.

We now prove 6. We may assume that $\tau_{f_1}(p') = \tau_f(\overline{p})$. There exists a smallest i such that $X_1 \rightarrow Z_{i+1}$ is an isomorphism at p'. Let p_2 be the image of p' in Z_{i+1}. Let p be the image of p_2 in Z_0.

If $Z_0 \to X$ is not an isomorphism at p, then $\overline{p}$ is a 2-point, and we have permissible parameters x, y, z at $\overline{p}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ll} u & = (x^ay^b)^k \\ v & = z \\ w & = \sum_{i,l\ge 0} a_{il}z^l(x^ay^b)^i + x^ey^f, \end{array} \tag{168}$$

where $\gcd(a,b) = 1$ and the sum is over i such that $(ia, ib) \not\ge (e, f)$. Since we are assuming w is good at $\overline{p}$ for f, we have $a_{il} = 0$ if k divides i.

Since $Z_0 \to X$ is a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves above $\overline{p}$, we have regular parameters x_1, y_1, z in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_0,p}$ such that

$$x = x_1^{\overline{a}}y_1^{\overline{b}}, y = x_1^{\overline{c}}y_1^{\overline{d}} \tag{169}$$

with $\overline{a}\overline{d} - \overline{b}\overline{c} = \pm 1$, (and $\gcd(a\overline{a} + b\overline{c}, a\overline{b} + b\overline{d}) = 1$) or

$$x = \overline{x}_1^{\overline{a}}(\overline{y}_1 + \alpha)^{\overline{b}}, y = \overline{x}_1^{\overline{c}}(\overline{y}_1 + \alpha)^{\overline{d}}$$

where $\overline{a}, \overline{c} \in \mathbf{N}$, $\overline{b}, \overline{d} \in \mathbf{Q}$, $0 \ne \alpha \in \mathbf{k}$ are such that

$$x^ay^b = \overline{x}_1^{\overline{a}a+\overline{c}b}, x^ey^f = \overline{x}_1^{\overline{a}e+\overline{c}f}(\overline{y}_1 + \alpha). \tag{170}$$

If either (169) or (170) holds, we see from substitution into (168) that w is good at p for $f \circ \Phi_0$.

Since $\overline{q}$ is a 1-point, $\overline{f}_0 = \Psi_1^{-1} \circ f \circ \Phi_0$ is not a morphism at p. Let p_1 be the image of p_2 in Z_i. At p_1 we have an expression (141) or (142).

First suppose that (141) holds at p_1. Since w is good at p for $f \circ \Phi_0$, we have $a_{ij} = 0$ if a divides i.

Suppose that (141) holds and at p_2 and there is an expression (148).

Suppose that $i + aj \in a\mathbf{Z}$ for some i. Then $i \in a\mathbf{Z}$, and since w is good at p for $f \circ \Phi_0$, we have that $a_{ij} = 0$. Thus w is good at p_2 for h_{i+1} (and w is good at p' for f_1).

Suppose that (141) holds and at p_2 there is an expression (149).

If w is not good at p_2 for h_{i+1}, there exists $a_{ij} \ne 0$ with $i + (b + 1)j < n$ and $i + (b + 1)j \in a\mathbf{Z} + (b + 1)\mathbf{Z}$. Thus $i \in a\mathbf{Z} + (b + 1)\mathbf{Z}$ which implies that i is in the kernel of the surjective projection homomorphism

$$[\sum_{a_{ij}\ne 0} i\mathbf{Z} + a\mathbf{Z}]/a\mathbf{Z}] \to [\sum_{a_{ij}\ne 0} i\mathbf{Z} + a\mathbf{Z} + (b + 1)\mathbf{Z}]/[a\mathbf{Z} + (b + 1)\mathbf{Z}].$$

thus

$$\tau_{f_1}(p') = \tau_{h_{i+1}}(p_2) < \tau_{f\circ\Phi_0}(p) \le \tau_f(\overline{p}),$$

a contradiction.

Suppose that (141) holds and at p_2 there is an expression (150).

Suppose that w is not good at p_2 for h_{i+1}. Then there exists $a_{ij} \ne 0$ with

$$(i + bj, i + (b + 1)j) \not\ge (n, n)$$

and

$$(i + bj, i + (b + 1)j) \in (a - b, a - b - 1)\mathbf{Z} + (b, b + 1)\mathbf{Z} = (a, a)\mathbf{Z} + (b, b + 1)\mathbf{Z},$$

which implies that $(i, i) \in (a, a)\mathbf{Z} + (b, b + 1)\mathbf{Z}$. Thus $i \in a\mathbf{Z}$, a contradiction, and we conclude that w is good at p_2 for h_{i+1}.

Now suppose that (142) holds at p_1. Since w is good at p for $f \circ \Phi_0$, we have $a_{il} = 0$ if k divides i.

Suppose that (142) holds and at p_2 there is an expression (152). Suppose that $(i + lk)(a, b) \not\ge (e, f)$ and $i + lk \in k\mathbf{Z}$. then $i \in k\mathbf{Z}$, and since w is good at p for $f \circ \Phi_0$, we have that $a_{il} = 0$. Thus w is good at p_2 for h_{i+1}.

Suppose that (142) holds and at p_2 there is an expression (153). Then by a similar calculation to the above, (154) is a strict inequality if w is not good at p_2 for h_{i+1}.

Suppose that (142) holds and at p_2 there is an expression (155). Then (156) is a strict inequality if w is not good at p_2 for h_{i+1}.

Suppose that (142) holds and p_2 has an expression (158). The homomorphism (159) has a nontrivial kernel if w is not good at p_2 for h_{i+1}.

In all of these cases, we have a contradiction to our assumption that $\tau_{f_1}(p') = \tau_f(\overline{p})$. □

Lemma 8.5. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared with relation R, $q \in Y - U(R)$ is a 2-point such that $q \in G_Y(f, \tau)$, and u, v, w are permissible parameters at q. Then there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that Φ and Ψ are products of blow ups of 2-curves, f_1 is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared, Φ is an isomorphism over $f^{-1}(Y - \Sigma(Y))$, and if $q_1 \in \Psi^{-1}(q)$ (with permissible parameters u_1, v_1, w), then if $p_1 \in f^{-1}(q)$ is such that $\tau_{f_1}(p_1) = \tau$, then there exists a series $\phi_{p_1}(u_1, v_1)$ such that $w - \phi_{p_1}(u_1, v_1)$ is good at p_1.

Proof. Let u, v, w be permissible parameters at q. By Lemma 5.5 and Lemma 8.1, there exist sequences of blow ups of 2-curves $\Psi_0 : Y_0 \rightarrow Y$ and $\Phi_0 : X_0 \rightarrow X$ making a pre-τ-quasi-well diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_0 \arrow[r, "f_0"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_0"'] & Y_0 \arrow[d, "\Psi_0"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that if $q_0 \in \Psi_0^{-1}(q)$ is a 2-point, then there are permissible parameters (u_0, v_0, w_0) at q_0 such that

$$u = u_0^a v_0^b, v = u_0^c, v_0^d$$

with $ad - bc = \pm 1$, and there are no points of the form 2 (b) or 2 (c) of Definition 3.6 for f_0 above q_0.

We construct an infinite commutative diagram of morphisms

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\vdots \arrow[d] & \vdots \arrow[d] \\
X_n \arrow[r, "f_n"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_n"'] & Y_n \arrow[d, "\Psi_n"] \\
\vdots \arrow[d, "\Phi_2"'] & \vdots \arrow[d, "\Psi_2"] \\
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\
X_0 \arrow[r, "f_0"] & Y_0
\end{tikzcd} \tag{171}$$

as follows. Order the 2-curves of Y_0 which intersect $\Psi_0^{-1}(q)$, and let $\Psi_1 : Y_1 \rightarrow Y_0$ be the blow up of the 2-curve C of smallest order. Then construct (by Lemma 8.1) a pre-τ-quasi-well diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd} \tag{172}$$

where Ψ_1 is a product of blow up of 2-curves and Φ_1 is an isomorphism above $f^{-1}(Y-C)$. Order the 2-curves of Y_1 which intersect $(\Psi_0\circ\Psi_1)^{-1}(q)$ so that the 2-curves contained in the exceptional divisor of Ψ_1 have larger order than the order of the (strict transforms of the) 2-curves of Y_0.

Let $\Psi_2 : Y_2 \rightarrow Y_1$ be the blow up of the 2-curve C_1 on Y_1 of smallest order, and construct a pre-τ-quasi-well diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_2 \arrow[r, "f_2"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_2"'] & Y_2 \arrow[d, "\Psi_2"] \\ X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] & Y_1 \end{tikzcd}$$

as in (172). We now iterate to construct (171). Let

$$\overline{\Psi}_n = \Psi_0\circ\Psi_1\circ\cdot\circ\Psi_n : Y_n \rightarrow Y,$$

$$\overline{\Phi}_n = \Phi_0\circ\Phi_1\circ\cdots\circ\Phi_n : X_n \rightarrow X.$$

For all $q_n\in\overline{\Psi}_n^{-1}(q)$ there exist permissible parameters u_n, v_n, w at q_n such that

$$u = u_n^a(v_n+\alpha)^b, v = u_n^c(v_n+\alpha)^d$$

with $ad-bc\neq 0$ and $\alpha\in\mathbf{k}$. q_n is a 2-point if $\alpha=0$, and a 1-point if $\alpha\neq 0$

Suppose that $p_n\in(\overline{\Psi}_n\circ f_n)^{-1}(q)$. We will say that p_n is good for $q_n = f_n(p_n)$ if $\tau_{f_n}(p_n) < \tau$ or if $\tau_{f_n}(p_n) = \tau$ and there exists a series $\phi_{p_n}(u_n, v_n)$ such that $w-\phi_{p_n}(u_n, v_n)$ is good for f_n at p_n.

We first observe that if p_n is good for q_n at $p_{n+1}\in\Phi_{n+1}^{-1}(p_n)$, then p_{n+1} is good for q_{n+1}. (This follows from 3 of Lemma 8.1).

Let ν be a zero-dimensional valuation of $\mathbf{k}(X)$ whose center on Y is q, and let p_n be the center of ν on X_n, $q_n = f_n(p_n)$.

We will show that there exists n_0 such that $n\geq n_0$ implies p_n is good for q_n.

Once we have established this, it will follow from compactness of the Zariski-Riemann manifold of X [Z] that there exists n' such that all $p\in(\overline{\Psi}_{n'}\circ f_{n'})^{-1}(q)$ are good for $q' = f_{n'}(p)$, so that the conclusions of the theorem hold.

We may identify ν with an extension of ν to the quotient field of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y,q}$ which dominates $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y,q}$.

If $\nu(u)$ and $\nu(v)$ are rationally dependent, then there exists n_0 such that q_{n_0} is a 1-point, which implies that p_{n_0} is good (by Remark 5.9), and thus p_n is good for all $n\geq n_0$.

So we may assume that $\nu(u)$ and $\nu(v)$ are rationally independent. We then have that

$$u = u_n^{a_n}v_n^{b_n}, v = u_n^{c_n}v_n^{d_n}$$

with $a_nd_n - b_nc_n = \pm 1$ for all n. We thus have (for $n >> 0$) that q_n is a 2-point, and p_n has one of the forms (173) or (174) below:

p_n is a 2-point

$$\begin{aligned} u_n &= x_n^a y_n^b \\ v_n &= x_n^c y_n^d \\ w &= \gamma_n + x_n^e y_n^f(z_n+\beta) \end{aligned} \tag{173}$$

with

$$\gamma_n = \sum \alpha_i M_i,$$

$\beta, \alpha_i \in \mathbf{k}$,

$$M_i = x_1^{a_i} y_1^{b_i} \text{ and } M_i^{e_i} = u_1^{k_i} v_1^{l_i}$$

with $k_i, l_i, e_i \in \mathbf{Z}$, $e_i > 0$ and $a_i, b_i \in \mathbf{N}$, or

p_n is a 3-point

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_n & = x_n^a y_n^b z_n^c \\ v_n & = x_n^d y_n^e z_n^f \\ w & = \gamma_n + N \end{array} \tag{174}$$

with $N = x_n^{g_n} y_n^{h_n} z_n^{i_n}$, $\text{rank}(u_n, v_n, N) = 3$,

$$\gamma_n = \sum \alpha_i M_i,$$

$\alpha_i \in \mathbf{k}$,

$$M_i = x_1^{a_i} y_1^{b_i} z_1^{c_i} \text{ and } M_i^{e_i} = u_1^{k_i} v_1^{l_i}$$

with $k_i, l_i, e_i \in \mathbf{Z}$, $e_i > 0$ and $a_i, b_i, c_i \in \mathbf{N}$.

Further, for $n >> 0$, either all points p_n have the form (173) or all p_n have the form (174).

It is shown in the proof of Lemma 5.4 [C5] that if (174) holds, then for $n >> 0$, we have $k_i, l_i \in \mathbf{N}$ for all i, which implies there exists a good form for p_n at q_n. Essentially the same argument shows that the same statement holds if (173) holds for $n >> 0$. ☐

Lemma 8.6. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (or τ-well prepared or τ-very-well prepared) and $q \in U(R)$ is a 2-point (prepared of type 1 in Definition 7.5). Then q is a permissible center for R, and there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (or τ-well prepared or τ-very-well prepared) diagram (133) of R and the blow up $\Psi : Y_1 \rightarrow Y$ of q such that:*

1. *Φ is an isomorphism over $f^{-1}(Y - \Sigma(Y))$.*
2. *Suppose that f is τ-well prepared. Then*
   (a) *Let E be the exceptional divisor of Ψ. Suppose that $q_1 \in U(\overline{R}_i^1) \cap E$. Let $\gamma_i = \overline{S_{\overline{R}_i^1}(q_1) \cdot E}$. Then γ_i is a prepared curve for R^1 of type 6. Suppose that $q' \in U(\overline{R}_j^1) \cap E$. Let $\gamma_j = \overline{S_{\overline{R}_j^1}(q') \cdot E}$. Then either*
      (i) *$\gamma_i = \gamma_j$ or*
      (ii) *γ_i, γ_j intersect transversally at a 2 point on E (their tangent spaces have distinct directions at this point and are otherwise disjoint).*
   (b) *If γ is a prepared curve on Y then the strict transform of γ is a prepared curve on Y_1.*

The proof of Lemma 8.6 is a straightforward generalization of Lemma 7.13 [C5].

Lemma 8.7. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (or τ-well prepared or τ-very-well prepared) with relation R. Suppose that $q \in Y$ is a 1-point or a 2-point such that $q \notin U(R)$ and q is prepared of type 2 of Definition 7.5 for R. Then q is a permissible center for R and there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (or τ-well prepared or τ-very-well prepared) diagram (133) of R and the blow up $\Psi : Y_1 \rightarrow Y$ of q such that:*

1. *Φ is an isomorphism over $f^{-1}(Y - \Sigma(Y))$*
2. *Suppose that f is τ-well prepared. If γ is a prepared curve on Y then the strict transform of γ is a prepared curve on Y_1.*

The proof of Lemma 8.7 is a straight forward generalization of Lemma 7.14 [C5]

Lemma 8.8. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (or τ-well prepared or τ-very-well prepared), $q \in U(R)$ is a 1-point (which is prepared of type 4 of Definition 7.5). Then there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (or τ-well prepared or τ-very-well prepared) diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd} \tag{175}$$

where Ψ is the blow up of q such that

1. *Φ is a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves over $f^{-1}(Y - \{q\})$.*
2. *Let E be the exceptional divisor of Ψ. Suppose that $q_1 \in U(\overline{R}^1_i) \cap E$. Let $\gamma_i = \overline{S_{\overline{R}^1_i}(q_1) \cdot E}$. Then γ_i is a prepared curve for R^1 of type 6. Suppose that $q' \in U(\overline{R}^1_j) \cap E$. Let $\gamma_j = \overline{S_{\overline{R}^1_j}(q') \cdot E}$. Then either*
    - (a) *$\gamma_i = \gamma_j$ or*
    - (b) *γ_i, γ_j intersect transversally at a 2 point on E (their tangent spaces have distinct directions at this point and are otherwise disjoint).*
3. *If γ is a prepared curve on Y then the strict transform of γ is a prepared curve on Y_1.*

The proof of Lemma 8.8 is a variant of the proof of Lemma 7.13 [C5], keeping in mind the simpler forms 5 and 6 of Definition 5.1 of super parameters above a 1-point, and the simpler from (131) of 3 of Definition 7.3 at q.

Lemma 8.9. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared, $\overline{q} \in Y$ is a 1-point such that $\overline{q} \not\in U(R)$, and $C \subset D_Y$ is an integral curve such that $\overline{q} \in C$. Suppose that C satisfies 2 and 4 of Definition 7.4 of a resolving curve. Then there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

such that

1. *Ψ_1 is a product of blow ups of 2-curves and 2-points, Φ_1 is a product of possible blow ups, Φ_1 is an isomorphism over $f^{-1}(Y - \Sigma(Y))$.*
2. *Let $\overline{C}$ be the strict transform of C on Y_1. Then $\overline{C}$ is a resolving curve for f_1 and R^1 at $\overline{q}$.*

Proof. There exists a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves $\Psi_1 : Y_1 \rightarrow Y$ such that the strict transform C_1 of C on Y_1 contains no 3-points. Let

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd} \tag{176}$$

be the pre-τ-quasi-well prepared diagram obtained by iterating the construction of Lemma 8.1.

Now by Lemma 8.1 and Lemma 5.6 [C5], there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_2 \arrow[r, "f_2"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_2"'] & Y_2 \arrow[d, "\Psi_2"] \\
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] & Y_1
\end{tikzcd} \tag{177}$$

obtained by iterating the construction of Lemma 8.1 such that Ψ_2 and Ψ_2 are products of blow ups of 2-curves, and for all 2-points q on the strict transform C_2 of C on Y_2, there exist super parameters u, v, w at q.

Let $\Psi_3 : Y_3 \rightarrow Y_2$ be the blow up of the 2-points on C_2. By Lemma 8.7, there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_3 \arrow[r, "f_3"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_3"'] & Y_3 \arrow[d, "\Psi_3"] \\
X_2 \arrow[r, "f_2"] & Y_2.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{178}$$

By iterating the above construction, (and by embedded resolution of plane curve singularities, c.f. Section 3.4, Exercise 3.13 [C6]) we eventually construct a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X' \arrow[r, "f'"] \arrow[d, "\Phi'"'] & Y' \arrow[d, "\Psi'"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that the strict transform C' of C on Y' is nonsingular and makes SNCs with $D_{Y'}$. If $q \in C'$ is a 2-point, let u, v, w be permissible parameters at q such that $u = w = 0$ are local equations of C'.

By Lemma 8.1 and Lemma 5.6 [C5], there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X'' \arrow[r, "f''"] \arrow[d, "\Phi''"'] & Y'' \arrow[d, "\Psi''"] \\
X' \arrow[r, "f'"] & Y'
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that 3 of Definition 7.4 holds for the strict transform of C on Y''. Thus the conclusions of the lemma hold. ☐

Lemma 8.10. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is τ-very-well prepared and $C \subset Y$ is a prepared curve of type 6 (of Definition 7.6). Further suppose that $q_\delta \in C \cap U(\overline{R}_j)$ for some $\overline{R}_j$ associated to R implies $C = \overline{E \cdot S_{\overline{R}_j}(q_\delta)}$ for some component E of D_X. Then C is a *-permissible center for R, and there exists a τ-very-well prepared diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

of R of the form of (134).

The proof of Lemma 8.10 is a straight forward generalization of Lemma 7.15 [C5]

Remark 8.11. 1. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared and $C \subset D_Y$ is a nonsingular (integral) curve which makes SNCs with D_Y and contains a 1-point such that*
   (a) *$q \in C \cap U(\overline{R}_i)$ for some pre-relation $\overline{R}_i$ associated to R implies the (formal) germ of C at q is contained in $S_{\overline{R}_i}(q)$, and*
   (b) *$q \in C - U(R)$ implies there exist super parameters u, v, w at q such that $u = w = 0$ are local equations of C at q.*

Then there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{X}_1 \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_1"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_1"'] & \overline{Y}_1 \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_1"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\overline{\Psi}_1$ is the blow up of C.

2. *Further suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is τ-well prepared, and if $\gamma = \overline{E \cdot R_k(q_\alpha)}$ is prepared for R of type 6, then either $C = \gamma$ or $q \in C \cap \gamma$ implies $q \in U(\overline{R}_k)$ and the germ of C at q is contained in $S_{R_k}(q)$. Then there exists a τ-well prepared diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

where Ψ is the blow up $\overline{\Psi}_1$ of C, possibly followed by blow ups of 2-points which are prepared for the transform of R (of type 2 of Definition 7.5) if C is prepared of type 6 for R, such that
   - (a) *If $\gamma \subset Y$ is prepared for f, (and $\gamma \neq C$) then the strict transform of γ is prepared for f_1.*
   - (b) *If $C \subset Y$ is prepared for f (of type 6) and $q \in U(\overline{R}_i) \cap C$ for some i, then $\overline{E \cdot S_{\overline{R}_i^1}(q')}$ is prepared for f_1 (of type 6) for all $q' \in E \cap U(\overline{R}_i^1)$, where E is the component of D_{Y_1} dominating C.*

The proof of Remark 8.11 is a straight forward generalization of Lemma 7.15 [C5] and Remark 7.16 [C5]

9. CONSTRUCTION OF A τ-VERY WELL PREPARED MORPHISM

Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a dominant, proper morphism of nonsingular 3-folds, with toroidal structures D_Y and $D_X = f^{-1}(D_Y)$.

Theorem 9.1. *Suppose that $\tau \geq 0$, $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is τ-prepared, $q \in Y$ is a 1-point or a 2-point, and u, v, w are permissible parameters at q such that u, v are toroidal forms at p for all $p \in f^{-1}(q)$ and $u, v \in \mathcal{O}_{Y,q}$. Then there exists an affine neighborhood V of q in Y and a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\
f^{-1}(V) \arrow[r, "f"] & V
\end{tikzcd} \tag{179}$$

such that $u = v = 0$ are local equations of a nonsingular curve γ_0 in V, Ψ_1 is a product of possible blow ups of 2-curves and resolving curves which are sections over γ_0, Φ_1 is a product of possible blow ups, f_1 is τ-prepared, $\tau_{f_1}(p_1) \leq \tau_f(\Phi_1(p_1))$ for $p_1 \in X_1$, and there exist permissible parameters $u_{q'}, v_{q'}, w$ at all $q' \in \Psi_1^{-1}(q)$ such that u, v are related to $u_{q'}, v_{q'}$ birationally and $u_{q'}, v_{q'}, w$ are super parameters at q'.

Proof. Let V be an affine neighborhood of q on which u, v, w are uniformizing parameters and the intersection of the fundamental locus of f with the curve $u = v = 0$ on V is $\{q\}$. Let $W = f^{-1}(V)$ and $\overline{f} = f \mid W$. We have a smooth morphism $\pi_0 : V \rightarrow S_0 = \mathrm{spec}(\mathbf{k}[u, v])$. Give S_0 the toroidal structure

$$D_{S_0} = \begin{cases} uv = 0 & \text{if } q \text{ is a 2-point} \\ u = 0 & \text{if } q \text{ is a 1-point.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\overline{q} = \pi_0(q)$. The morphism $\pi_0 \circ \overline{f} : W \rightarrow S_0$ is toroidal with respect to D_{S_0} and $(\pi_0 \circ \overline{f})^{-1}(D_{S_0})$. We construct a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
W_n \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_n"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_n"'] & V_n \arrow[r, "\pi_n"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_n"'] & S_n \arrow[d, "\Lambda_n"'] \\
\vdots \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_2"'] & \vdots \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_2"'] & \vdots \arrow[d, "\Lambda_2"'] \\
W_1 \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_1"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_1"'] & V_1 \arrow[r, "\pi_1"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_1"'] & S_1 \arrow[d, "\Lambda_1"'] \\
W \arrow[r, "\overline{f}"] & V \arrow[r, "\pi_0"] & S_0.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{180}$$

Here $\Lambda_1 : S_1 \rightarrow S_0$ is the blow up of $\overline{q}$, $\overline{\Psi}_1$ is the blow up of $\gamma_0 = \pi_0^{-1}(\overline{q})$, which is the curve with equations $u = v = 0$ in V. If q is a 1-point then γ_0 is a resolving curve for $\overline{f}$ at q. $\overline{\Phi}_1$ is the morphism of Lemma 8.1 (if q is a 2-point) or Lemma 8.4 (if q is a 1-point). $\pi_1 \circ \overline{f}_1 : W_1 \rightarrow S_1$ is toroidal.

Suppose that $\overline{q}_1 \in \Lambda_1^{-1}(q)$. Then $\mathcal{O}_{S_1,\overline{q}_1}$ has regular parameters u_1, v_1 defined by

$$u = u_1, v = u_1(v_1 + \alpha) \tag{181}$$

for some $\alpha \in \mathbf{k}$, or

$$u = u_1 v_1, v = v_1. \tag{182}$$

$\Lambda_2 : S_2 \rightarrow S_1$ is the blow up of all points $\overline{q}_1$ above $\overline{q}$ such that there exists a point q_1 in $\pi_1^{-1}(\overline{q}_1)$ such that u_1, v_1, w are not super parameters at q_1. $\overline{\Psi}_2 : V_2 \rightarrow V_1$ is the blow up of the (disjoint) curves $\gamma_1 = \pi_1^{-1}(\overline{q}_1)$, and $\overline{\Phi}_2 : W_2 \rightarrow W_1$ is the morphism of Lemma 8.1 or Lemma 8.4. $\pi_2 \circ \overline{f}_2 : W_2 \rightarrow S_2$ is toroidal.

We continue in this way to construct (180) as long as $\overline{f}_n : W_n \rightarrow V_n$ does not satisfy the conclusions of the theorem.

Suppose that the algorithm never ends.

Let ν be a 0-dimensional valuation of $\mathbf{k}(X)$ whose center on Y is q, and let p_i be the center of ν on W_i, q_i the center of ν on V_i. Let $\overline{q}_i = \pi_i(q_i)$. We may suppose that $\overline{\Psi}_i$ is not an isomorphism at the center of ν for all i. There exist permissible parameters u_i, v_i, w_i at q_i for all i such that u_i, v_i are regular parameters in $\mathcal{O}_{S_i,\overline{q}_i}$, obtained by iteration of (181) and (182), as determined by ν. We will show that there exists j_0 such that u_j, v_j, w are super parameters at p_j for all $j \geq j_0$. If u_i, v_i, w are super parameters at p_i for some i, we have that u_j, v_j, w are super parameters at p_j for all $j \geq i$. Suppose that u_i, v_i, w are not super parameters at p_i for all i.

We may identify ν with an extension of ν to the quotient field of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ which dominates $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$.

There exist permissible parameters x_i, y_i, z_i in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{W_i,p_i}$ such that we have one of the following forms:

p_i a 1-point, q_i (and $\overline{q}_i$) a 1-point

$$u_i = x_i^{a_i}, v_i = y_i \tag{183}$$

or p_i a 2-point, q_i (and $\overline{q}_i$) a 1-point

$$u_i = (x_i^{a_i} y_i^{b_i})^k, v_i = z_i \tag{184}$$

p_i a 1-point, q_i (and $\overline{q}_i$) a 2-point

$$u_i = x_i^{a_i}, v_i = x_i^{b_i}(y_i + \alpha_i) \tag{185}$$

with $0 \neq \alpha_i$ or p_i a 2-point, q_i (and $\overline{q}_i$) a 2-point

$$u_i = x_i^{a_i} y_i^{b_i}, v_i = x_i^{c_i} y_i^{d_i} \tag{186}$$

p_i a 2-point, q_i (and $\overline{q}_i$) a 2-point

$$u_i = (x_i^{a_i} y_i^{b_i})^{k_i}, v_i = (x_i^{a_i} y_i^{b_i})^{t_i}(z_i + \alpha_i) \tag{187}$$

with $\alpha_i \neq 0$ or p_i a 3-point, q_i (and $\overline{q}_i$) a 2-point

$$u_i = x_i^{a_i} y_i^{b_i} z_i^{ci}, v_i = x_i^{d_i} y_i^{e_i} z_i^{f_i} \tag{188}$$

Suppose that $f \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{S_0,\overline{q}}$. Then (by embedded resolution of plane curve singularities, c.f. Section 3.4, Exercise 3.13 [C6]) there exists an n_0 such that $uvf = 0$ is a SNC divisor in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{S_n,\overline{q}_n}$ for all $n \geq n_0$.

We further have that if $g \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{W,p}$ is a fractional series in u and v, then $g \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{W_n,p_n}$ is a fractional series in u_n and v_n.

First suppose that q_i is a 2-point for all i. Then $\nu(u)$ and $\nu(v)$ are rationally independent, and we have that (186) or (188) hold for all i.

We either have that p_i is a 3-point for all i (and a form (188) holds for all i) or some p_i is a 2-point, and thus (186) holds for all i sufficiently large.

If p_i is a 3-point for all i, it follows from Lemma 5.6 [C5] that u_i, v_i, w are super parameters at p_i for $i >> 0$, a contradiction.

Suppose that p_i is a 2-point for some i. We may then assume that p_i is a 2-point for all i, and (186) holds for all i.

We have an expression

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a y^b \\ v &= x^c y^d \\ w &= f_1(x,y) + x^l y^m z \end{aligned}$$

in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{W,p}$. There exists $n \in \mathbf{N}$ and $\overline{a}, \overline{b} \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that

$$x^n = u^{\overline{a}} v^{\overline{b}}, y^n = u^{\overline{c}} v^{\overline{d}}.$$

$\nu(u^{\overline{a}} v^{\overline{b}}) = \nu(x^n) > 0$, $\nu(u^{\overline{c}} v^{\overline{d}}) = \nu(y^n) > 0$ imply that for $i >> 0$,

$$u^{\overline{a}} v^{\overline{b}} = u_i^{\overline{a}_i} v_i^{\overline{b}_i}, u^{\overline{c}} v^{\overline{d}} = u_i^{\overline{c}_i} v_i^{\overline{d}_i}$$

with $\overline{a}_i, \overline{b}_i, \overline{c}_i, \overline{d}_i \in \mathbf{N}$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} u_i &= x_i^{a_i} y_i^{b_i} \\ v_i &= x_i^{c_i} y_i^{d_i} \\ w &= f_1(x,y) + (x_i^{e_i} y_i^{f_i})^l (x_i^{g_i} y_i^{h_i})^m z. \end{aligned}$$

$$f_1(x,y) = f_1((u^{\overline{a}} v^{\overline{b}})^{\frac{1}{n}}, (u^{\overline{c}} v^{\overline{d}})^{\frac{1}{n}}) = g_1(u_i^{\frac{1}{n}}, v_i^{\frac{1}{n}}) \in \mathbf{k}[[u_i^{\frac{1}{n}}, v_i^{\frac{1}{n}}]].$$

Let $\omega \in \mathbf{k}$ be a primitive n-th of unity. Set

$$f = \prod_{i,j=1}^{n} g_1(\omega^i u_i^{\frac{1}{n}}, \omega^j v_i^{\frac{1}{n}}) \in \mathbf{k}[[u_i, v_i]].$$

Recall that for $i \geq n_0$, $fuv = 0$ is a SNC divisor in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{S_i,\overline{q}_i}$. Since $\overline{q}_i$ is a 2-point for all i,

$$fuv = u_i^{\overline{a}} v_i^{\overline{b}} \gamma$$

where γ is a unit series in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{S_i,\overline{q}_i}$. As $g_1 \mid f$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{W_i,p_i}$, we have that u_i, v_i, w are super parameters at p_i.

The final case is when q_i is a 1-point for some i.

Suppose that q_i is a 1-point for some i. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $q_i = q$ and $p_i = p$.

If p is a 1-point (and q is a 1-point), we have permissible parameters x, y, z in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{W,p}$ such that

$$u = x^a, v = y, w = f_1(x,y) + x^r z$$

of the form (183).

Set

$$f = \prod_{i=1}^{a} f_1(\omega^i u^{\frac{1}{a}}, v) \in \mathbf{k}[[u,v]]$$

where $\omega \in \mathbf{k}$ is a primitive a-th root of unity.

If p is a 2-point (and q is a 1-point), we have permissible parameters $x, y, z \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{W,p}$ such that

$$u = (x^a y^b)^k, v = z, w = f_1(x^a y^b, z) + x^c y^d$$

of the form (184). Set

$$f = \prod_{i=1}^{a} f_1(\omega^i u^{\frac{1}{k}}, v) \in \mathbf{k}[[u,v]]$$

where $\omega \in \mathbf{k}$ is a primitive k-th root of unity.

Recall that $fuv = 0$ is a SNC divisor in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{S_i,\overline{q}_i}$ for $i \geq n_0$.

We will now show that if $i \geq n_0$ and q_i is a 2-point, then u_i, v_i, w are super parameters at q_i. In these cases $\overline{q}_i$ is a 2-point, $u_i v_i = 0$ is a local equation of D_{V_i} and $u = 0$ is a local equation of D_{V_i}. Thus $fuv = u_i^m v_i^n \gamma$, where $m, n > 0$ and $\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{S_i,\overline{q}_i}$ is a unit series. Since $f_1 \mid f$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_i,p_i}$, and f_1 is a fractional series in u_i and v_i, we have the desired conclusion.

We have reduced to the case where q_i is a 1-point for all i.

Since $fuv = 0$ is a SNC divisor for $i \geq n_0$, the only cases where u_i, v_i, w are not super parameters at p_i are if u_i, v_i satisfy (183) at p_i, and

$$u_i = x_i^a, v_i = y_i, w = x_i^s (y_i - \phi(x_i^a))^r \gamma(x_i, y_i) + x_i^c (z_i + \alpha) \tag{189}$$

where γ is a unit series, $\alpha \in \mathbf{k}$, or p_i satisfies (184), and

$$u_i = (x_i^a y_i^b)^k, v_i = z_i, w = (x_i^a y_i^b)^s (z_1 - \phi((x_i^a y_i^b)^k))^r \gamma(x_i^a y_i^b, z_i) + x_i^c y_i^d \tag{190}$$

where $\gcd(a,b) = 1$, ord $\phi > 0$ and γ is a unit series.

We consider the case when (190) holds at p_i. The case (189) is similar.

By the constructions of Lemma 8.1 and Lemma 8.4, we have a factorization of $W_{i+1} \rightarrow W_i$, by monoidal transforms

$$W_{i+1} = Z_m \overset{\Omega_m}{\rightarrow} Z_{m-1} \overset{\Omega_{m-1}}{\rightarrow} \cdots \overset{\Omega_2}{\rightarrow} Z_1 \overset{\Omega_1}{\rightarrow} Z_0 = W_i$$

Let a_j be the center of ν on Z_j. We may assume that each morphism $Z_l \rightarrow Z_{l-1}$ is not an isomorphism at the center of ν.

If $a_j < m$, we have permissible parameters x_{ij}, y_{ij}, z_{ij} in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Z_j,a_j}$ such that a_j is a 2-point and

$$\begin{aligned} u_i &= (x_{ij}^a y_{ij}^b)^k, \\ v_i &= z_{ij} x_{ij}^{e_i} y_{ij}^{f_i}, \\ w &= (x_{ij}^a y_{ij}^b)^s (z_{ij} x_{ij}^{e_i} y_{ij}^{f_i} - \phi((x_{ij}^a y_{ij}^b)^k)^r \gamma(x_{ij}^a y_{ij}^b, z_{ij} x_{ij}^{e_i} y_{ij}^{f_i}) + x_{ij}^c y_{ij}^d \end{aligned} \tag{191}$$

with $(e_i, f_i) < (ak, bk)$.

After possibly interchanging x_{ij} and y_{ij}, we have that $e_i < ak$ and there are regular parameters $x_{i,j+1}, y_{i,j+1}, z_{i,j+1}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Z_{j+1},a_{j+1}}$ defined by

$$x_{ij} = x_{i,j+1}, z_{ij} = x_{i,j+1}(z_{i,j+1} + \alpha). \tag{192}$$

or

$$x_{ij} = x_{i,j+1}z_{i,j+1}, z_{ij} = z_{i,j+1}. \tag{193}$$

Suppose that (192) holds. Then

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_i & = (x_{i,j+1}^a y_{i,j+1}^b)^k \\ v_i & = (z_{i,j+1} + \alpha)x_{i,j+1}^{e_i+1} y_{i,j+1}^{f_i} \\ w & = (x_{i,j+1}^a y_{i,j+1}^b)^s [x_{i,j+1}^{e_i+1} y_{i,j+1}^{f_i}(z_{i,j+1} + \alpha) - \phi((x_{i,j+1}^a y_{i,j+1}^b)^k)]^r \\ & \gamma(x_{i,j+1}^a y_{i,j+1}^b, x_{i,j+1}^{e_i+1} y_{i,j+1}^{f_i}(z_{i,j+1} + \alpha)) + x_{i,j+1}^c y_{i,j+1}^d. \end{array} \tag{194}$$

Suppose that $0 \neq \alpha$, $(e_i + 1, f_i) < (ak, bk)$ and $af_i - b(e_i + 1) \neq 0$ in (194). Then the rational map $Z_{j+1} \to V_{i+1}$ is a morphism near $a_{j+1} = p_{i+1}$.

We make a change of variables, to get permissible parameters $\overline{x}, \overline{y}, \overline{z} \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{W_{i+1},p_{i+1}}$ and $0 \neq \beta \in \mathbf{k}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_{i+1} & = \frac{u_i}{v_i} = x_{i,j+1}^{ak-(e_i+1)} y_{i,j+1}^{bk-f_i}(z_{i,j+1} + \alpha)^{-1} = \overline{x}^{ak-(e_i+1)}\overline{y}^{bk-f_i} \\ v_{i+1} & = v_i = (z_{i,j+1} + \alpha)x_{i,j+1}^{e_i+1} y_{i,j+1}^{f_i} = \overline{x}^{e_i+1}\overline{y}^{f_i} \\ w & = (\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b)^s[\overline{x}^{e_i+1}\overline{y}^{f_i} - \phi((\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b)^k)]^r\gamma(\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b, \overline{x}^{e_i+1}\overline{y}^{f_i}) + \overline{x}^c\overline{y}^d(\overline{z} + \beta) \\ & = \overline{x}^{as+r(e_i+1)}\overline{y}^{bs+rf_i}(1 - \frac{\phi((\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b)^k)}{\overline{x}^{e_i+1}\overline{y}^{f_i}})^r\gamma(\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b, \overline{x}^{e_i+1}\overline{y}^{f_i}) + \overline{x}^c\overline{y}^d(\overline{z} + \beta) \end{array}$$

and u_{i+1}, v_{i+1}, w are super parameters at p_{i+1}.

Suppose that (192) holds, $0 \neq \alpha$, $(e_i + 1, f_i) < (ak, bk)$ and $(e_i + 1, f_i) = t_i(a, b)$ for some integer t_i. Then we make a change of variable to get permissible parameters $\overline{x}, \overline{y}, \overline{z} \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{W_{i+1},p_{i+1}}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_{i+1} & = \frac{u_i}{v_i} = (\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b)^{k-t_i} \\ v_{i+1} & = v_i = (\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b)^{t_i}(\overline{z} + \alpha) \\ w & = (\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b)^s(\overline{z} + \alpha)^{\frac{s}{k}}[(\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b)^{t_i}(\alpha + \overline{z}) - \phi((\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b)^k(\overline{z} + \alpha))]^r \\ & \gamma(\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b(\overline{z} + \alpha)^{\frac{1}{k}}, (\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b)^{t_i})(\overline{z} + \alpha)) + \overline{x}^c\overline{y}^d \\ & = (\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b)^{s+t_ir}(\overline{z} + \alpha)^{\frac{s}{k}}(\alpha + \overline{z} - \frac{\phi((\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b)^k(\overline{z}+\alpha))}{(\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b)^{t_i}})^r \\ & \gamma(\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b(\overline{z} + \alpha)^{\frac{1}{k}}, (\overline{x}^a\overline{y}^b)^{t_i}(\overline{z} + \alpha)) + \overline{x}^c\overline{y}^d \end{array}$$

as $t_i < k$, and u_{i+1}, v_{i+1}, w are thus super parameters at p_{i+1}.

Suppose that (192) holds, and $(e_i + 1, f_i) = (ak, bk)$. Then the rational map $Z_{j+1} \to V_{i+1}$ is a morphism near $a_{j+1} = p_{i+1}$, and the 1-point q_{i+1} has permissible parameters defined by

$$u_i = u_{i+1}, v_i = u_{i+1}(v_{i+1} + \alpha).$$

Substituting into (194), we see that

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_{i+1} & = (x_{i,j+1}^a y_{i,j+1}^b)^k \\ v_{i+1} & = z_{i,j+1} \\ w & = (x_{i,j+1}^a y_{i,j+1}^b)^{s+kr}[z_{i,j+1} + \alpha - \frac{\phi((x_{i,j+1}^a y_{i,j+1}^b)^k)}{(x_{i,j+1}^a y_{i,j+1}^b)^k}]^r\gamma + x_{i,j+1}^c y_{i,j+1}^d. \end{array}$$

Thus u_{i+1}, v_{i+1}, w are super parameters at p_{i+1}, or we have a form (190), with

$$(c - as, d - bs) > (c - (a(s + kr), d - b(s + kr)). \tag{195}$$

In fact, $(c - (a(s + kr), d - b(s + kr))$ must decrease from $(c - as, d - bs)$ by at least $(1, 1)$.

If we have (192) with $(e_i+1, f_i) < (ak, bk)$ with $\alpha = 0$, then (194) is back in the form (191) (with a decrease in $(ak-e_i)+(bk-f_i)$.

Suppose that (193) holds. The rational map $Z_{j+1} \rightarrow V_{i+1}$ is a morphism near $a_{j+1} = p_{i+1}$, and the 2-point q_{i+1} has permissible parameters defined by $u_i = u_{i+1}v_{i+1}, v_i = v_{i+1}$. Substituting into (191), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
u_{i+1} &= x_{i,j+1}^{ak-e_i} y_{i,j+1}^{bk-f_i} z_{i,j+1}^{ak-e_i-1}\\
v_{i+1} &= x_{i,j+1}^{e_i} y_{i,j+1}^{f_i} z_{i,j+1}^{e_i+1}\\
w &= (x_{i,j+1}^{a} y_{i,j+1}^{b} z_{i,j+1}^{a})^s (x_{i,j+1}^{e_i} y_{i,j+1}^{f_i} z_{i,j+1}^{e_i+1} - \phi((x_{i,j+1}^{a} y_{i,j+1}^{b} z_{i,j+1}^{a})^k))^r\gamma\\
&\quad +x_{i,j+1}^{c} y_{i,j+1}^{d} z_{i,j+1}^{c}\\
&= (x_{i,j+1}^{a} y_{i,j+1}^{b} z_{i,j+1}^{a})^s (x_{i,j+1}^{e_i} y_{i,j+1}^{f_i} z_{i,j+1}^{e_i+1})^r (1 - \frac{\phi((x_{i,j+1}^{a} y_{i,j+1}^{b} z_{i,j+1}^{a})^k)}{x_{i,j+1}^{e_i} y_{i,j+1}^{f_i} z_{i,j+1}^{e_i+1}})^r\gamma\\
&\quad +x_{i,j+1}^{c} y_{i,j+1}^{d} z_{i,j+1}^{c}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus u_{i+1}, v_{i+1}, w are super parameters at the 3-point p_{i+1}.

We thus have that u_i, v_i, w are super parameters at p_i for $i >> 0$ unless each p_i has a form (190), and by (195) we eventually get

$$(c-as, d-bs) < (0,0).$$

We thus have that $w = x_i^c y_i^d \gamma$ where γ is a unit series. Thus u_i, v_i, w are super parameters at p_i.

We have shown that for any 0-dimensional valuation ν of $\mathbf{k}(X)$ whose center is q on Y, there exists j_1 such that u_j, v_j, w are super parameters at p_j for $j \geq j_1$. By compactness of the Zariski Riemann manifold [Z], it follows that the sequence (180) must terminate after a finite number of steps, in $W_n \rightarrow V_n$ satisfying the conclusions of the theorem.

$\square$

Theorem 9.2. *Suppose that $\tau \geq 0$, $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (or τ-well prepared) with relation R, and $C \subset Y$ is a reduced (but possibly not irreducible) curve consisting of components of the fundamental locus of f which contain a 1-point of Y. Then there exist sequences of possible blow ups $\Phi_1 : X_1 \rightarrow X$ and $\Psi_1 : Y_1 \rightarrow Y$ such that there is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd} \tag{196}$$

satisfying

1. $$\tau_{f_1}(p_1) \leq \tau_f(\Phi_1(p_1))$$
   for $p_1 \in D_{X_1}$.
2. *f_1 is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared with respect to a relation R^1.*
3. *$\Phi_1^{-1}(T(R)) \cap G_{X_1}(f_1, \tau) \subset T(R^1)$.*
4. *If f is τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared) then (196) is a τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared) diagram.*
5. *The strict transform $\overline{C}$ of C on Y_1 is nonsingular and makes SNCs with D_{Y_1}.*
6. *If C_j is an irreducible component of $\overline{C}$ and $q \in U(\overline{R}_i^1)$ for some $\overline{R}_i^1$ associated to R^1 is such that $q \in C_j$ then the germ of C_j at q is contained in $S_{\overline{R}_i^1}(q)$.*

7. *If* f *is* τ*-well prepared,* C_j *is an irreducible component of* $\overline{C}$, E *is a component of* D_{Y_1}, $q_\alpha \in U(R_k^1) \cap E$, *and* $\gamma = \overline{E \cdot R_k^1(q_\alpha)}$ *is prepared for* R^1 *of type 6 (of Definition 7.6), then either* $C_j = \gamma$ *or* $q \in C_j \cap \gamma$ *implies* $q \in U(\overline{R}_k^1)$ *(and thus the germ of* C_j *at* q *is contained in* $S_{R_k}(q)$ *by 5).*
8. *The components* C_j *of* $\overline{C}$ *are permissible centers (or *-permissible centers if* f *is* τ*-well prepared and* C_j *is prepared of type 6) for* R^1.
9. ψ_1 *is a sequence of blow ups of prepared 1-points, prepared 2-points, 2-curves and resolving curves.*

There is a pre-τ*-quasi-well prepared (or* τ*-well prepared) diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_2 \arrow[r, "f_2"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_2"'] & Y_2 \arrow[d, "\Psi_2"] \\
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] & Y_1
\end{tikzcd}$$

where Ψ_2 *is the blow up of* $\overline{C}$*, possibly followed by blow ups of 2-points which are prepared of type 2 of Definition 7.5 for the transform of* R *if* f *is* τ*-well prepared, and* C *contains a component which is prepared of type 6 for* R.

Proof. Let $\{q_1, \ldots, q_m\}$ be the 1-points of C which are not contained in $U(R)$, and for which there do not exist super parameters $u, v, w \in \mathcal{O}_{Y,q}$ such that $u = w = 0$ are local equations of C at q. This set is finite by Lemma 5.11.

Step 1. Let γ_1 be a general curve through q_1 on D_Y.

If $q \in \gamma_1$ is a 1-point, then there exist permissible parameters $u, v, w \in \mathcal{O}_{Y,q}$, such that u, v have a toroidal form at p for all $p \in f^{-1}(q)$, $u = v = 0$ are local equations of γ_1 at q, and either u, v, w are toroidal forms at p for all $p \in f^{-1}(q)$, or $u = w = 0$ is a local equation of C at q. This follows from (the proof of) Lemma 3.7 since γ_1 intersects the fundamental locus of f transversally at general points of one dimensional components of the fundamental locus.

Since γ_1 is a general curve through q_1, $(\gamma_1 - \{q_1\}) \cap G_Y(f, \tau) \subset \Theta(f, Y)$ by Remark 5.16. Suppose that $q \in (\gamma_1 - \{q_1\}) \cap (G_Y(f, \tau) - U(R))$.

Since q is perfect for f and by Lemma 5.10, there exist locally closed subsets $\overline{V}_1, \ldots, \overline{V}_n$ of X which are a partition of $G_X(f, \tau) \cap f^{-1}(q)$ and series

$$\phi_1(u, v), \ldots, \phi_n(u, v)$$

such that $u, v, w_i = w - \phi_i$ are super parameters for f at q and w_i is weakly good at p for $p \in \overline{V}_i$. Here $u, v, w \in \mathcal{O}_{Y,q}$ are permissible parameters at the 1-point q such that u, v have a toroidal form at p, $u = v = 0$ are local equations of γ_1 at q, and $u = w = 0$ are local equations of C at q.

If $p \in f^{-1}(q)$ is a 1-point and $\tau_f(p) > 0$, then $w_i = 0$ is supported on D_X at p, since u, v, w_i are super parameters at q.

By blowing up 2-curves above X, by a map $\Phi_1 : X_1 \to X$, with induced map $f_1 = f \circ \Phi_1 : X_1 \to Y$, and substitution of local forms of Φ_1 in (67), we obtain that $w_i = 0$ is supported on D_{X_1} at p_1 for all $p_1 \in f_1^{-1}(q)$ such that $\tau_{f_1}(p_1) > 0$. u, v, w_p are super parameters for f_1 at q.

By Lemma 5.3 and Remark 8.2, there exist locally closed subsets $V_1, \ldots, V_n$ of X_1 which are a partition of $G_{X_1}(f_1, \tau) \cap f_1^{-1}(q)$ such that

1. $u, v, w_i = w - \phi_i(u, v)$ are super parameters for f_1 at q
2. w_i is weakly good at p for $p \in V_i$
3. $w_i = 0$ is supported on D_{X_1} at p for $p \in V_i$ if $\tau > 0$.

Suppose that $\tau > 0$. Then there exists a relation $w_i^{e_i} - u^{a_i}\Lambda_i = 0$ for $p \in V_i \cap D_{X_1}$, where Λ_i is a unit on V_i, $e_i, a_i \in \mathbf{N}$, $e_i > 1$ and $\gcd(e_i, a_i) = 1$. Since u, v, w_i are super parameters at the 1-point q, we see from (66) and (67) that there exists $\lambda_q^i \in \mathbf{k}$ such that $\Lambda_i(p) = \lambda_q^i$ for $p \in V_i$.

Suppose that $\tau = 0$. Then $w_i = 0$ is a monomial form at p for $p \in V_i$ by Remark 5.8.

We may now define relations $R_{q,i}$ for f_1 by $T(R_{q,i}) = V_i$, $U(R_{q,i}) = \{q\}$, and define $R_{q,i}(p)$ for $p \in T(R_{q,i})$ by $R_{q,i} = w_i^{e_i} - \lambda_q^i u^{a_i}$ if $\tau > 0$ and by $R_{q,i} = w_i$ if $\tau = 0$.

We extend the transform R^1 of R on X_1 by adding in the new relations $R_{q,i}$ for all $q \in (\gamma_1 - \{q\}) \cap (G_Y(f,\tau) - U(R))$. $f_1 : X_1 \rightarrow Y$ is then pre-τ-quasi-well prepared for R^1. We have that

$$(\gamma_1 - \{q_1\}) \cap G_Y(f_1,\tau) \subset U(R^1).$$

By Lemma 8.6 and Lemma 8.8, and since for $q \in \gamma_1 \cap U(R_i^1)$, the germ of γ_1 at q is not contained in $S_{R_i^1}(q)$ for any relation R_i^1 associated to R^1 (γ_1 is general), there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared) diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_2 \arrow[r, "f_2"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_2"'] & Y_2 \arrow[d, "\Psi_2"] \\
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that Ψ_2 is a product of blow ups of prepared 1-points of type 4 (of Definition 7.5) and prepared 2-points of type 1 (of Definition 7.5) such that the strict transform γ_1^2 of γ_1 on Y_2 satisfies 1,2 and 4 of Definition 7.4 of a resolving curve for f_2 at q_1. Further, if $q \in \gamma_1^2$ is a 2-point, we have that $\tau_{f_2}(p) < \tau$ for $p \in f_2^{-1}(q)$. By Lemma 5.6 [C5] and Remark 8.3 there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared) diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_3 \arrow[r, "f_3"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_3"'] & Y_3 \arrow[d, "\Psi_3"] \\
X_2 \arrow[r, "f_2"] & Y_2
\end{tikzcd}$$

where Φ_3 is a product of blow ups of 2-curves and 3-points and Ψ_3 is a product of blow ups of 2-curves such that if $q \in \gamma_1^3$ is a 2-point, where γ_1^3 is the strict transform of γ_1 on Y_3, then there exist super parameters u, v, w for f_3 at q such that $u = w = 0$ are local equations of γ_1^3 at q. Thus γ_1^3 is a resolving curve for f_3 at $\overline{q}$.

Let

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_4 \arrow[r, "f_4"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_4"'] & Y_4 \arrow[d, "\Psi_4"] \\
X_3 \arrow[r, "f_1"] & Y_3
\end{tikzcd}$$

be the pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared) diagram of Lemma 8.4 where Ψ_4 is the blow up of γ_1^3. The strict transform C^4 of C on Y_4 intersects $\Psi_4^{-1}(q_1)$ in a 2-point. $Y_4 \rightarrow Y$ is an isomorphism over a neighborhood of $\{q_2, \ldots, q_m\}$.

Step 2.

Iterate the construction of Step 1 for the points $q_2, \ldots, q_m$. We obtain a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\tilde{X} \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}"] \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Phi}"'] & \tilde{Y} \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Psi}"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that $\tilde{f}$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared) with respect to a relation $\tilde{R}$, and if $\overline{C}$ is the strict transform of C on $\tilde{Y}$, and if $q\in\overline{C}-U(\tilde{R})$ is a 1-point, then there exist super parameters u, v, w at q such that $u=w=0$ are local equations of $\overline{C}$ at q.

Step 3. By Lemma 5.6 [C5] and Remark 8.3, there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared) diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}\tilde{X}_1 \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}_1"] \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Phi}_1"'] & \tilde{Y}_1 \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Psi}_1"] \\ \tilde{X} \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}"] & \tilde{Y}\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\tilde{\Phi}_1$ is a product of blow ups of 2-curves and 3-points, and $\tilde{\Psi}_1$ is a product of blow ups of 2-curves such that if $\overline{C}_1$ is the strict transform of $\overline{C}$ on $\tilde{Y}_1$, and $q\in\overline{C}_1$ is a 2-point not in $U(\tilde{R}_1)$, then there exist super parameters u, v, w at q, so that q is prepared of type 2 of Definition 7.5. Let

$$\begin{tikzcd}\tilde{X}_2 \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}_2"] \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Phi}_2"'] & \tilde{Y}_2 \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Psi}_2"] \\ \tilde{X}_1 \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}_1"] & \tilde{Y}_1\end{tikzcd}$$

be the pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared) diagram obtained by blowing up the 2-points on $\overline{C}_1-U(\tilde{R}^1)$ (by Lemma 8.7).

Step 4. By embedded resolution of plane curve singularities (c.f. Section 3.4 and Exercise 3.13 [C6]), we can iterate Step 3 to construct a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared) diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}\tilde{X}_3 \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}_3"] \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Phi}_3"'] & \tilde{Y}_3 \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Psi}_3"] \\ \tilde{X}_2 \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}_2"] & \tilde{Y}_2\end{tikzcd}$$

such that if $\overline{C}_3$ is the strict transform of C on $\tilde{Y}_3$ and $q\in\overline{C}_3-U(\tilde{R}^3)$ is a 2-point, then there exist super parameters u, v, w at q such that $u=w=0$ are local equations of $\overline{C}_3$.

Step 5. By embedded resolution of plane curve singularities (c.f. Section 3.4 and Exercise 3.13 [C6]), Lemma 8.1 (for 3-points in $\overline{C}_3$), Lemma 8.6 and Lemma 8.8, there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared) diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}\tilde{X}_4 \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}_4"] \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Phi}_4"'] & \tilde{Y}_4 \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Psi}_4"] \\ \tilde{X}_3 \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}_3"] & \tilde{Y}_3\end{tikzcd}$$

such that the strict transform $\overline{C}_4$ of C on $\tilde{Y}_4$ satisfies the hypotheses of 1 of Remark 8.11.

Step 6. If f is τ-well-prepared, then we must perform a final sequence of blowups. Assume that f (and thus $\tilde{f}_4$) is τ-well prepared (for the transform $\tilde{R}^4$ of R). Let

$$\Sigma=\left\{\begin{array}{ll} q\in\overline{C}_4 & \text{such that } q\in\gamma \text{ and } q\notin U(\tilde{R}^4)\\ & \quad\text{where } \gamma \text{ is a curve which is prepared of type 6 for } \tilde{R}^4.\end{array}\right\}.$$

Σ is a finite set of points which are prepared of type 2 of Definition 7.5 (by 5 b) of Definition 7.6).

By Lemma 8.7, and embedded resolution of plane curve singularities, we can construct a τ-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\tilde X_5 \arrow[r, "\tilde f_5"] \arrow[d, "\tilde\Phi_5"'] & \tilde Y_5 \arrow[d, "\tilde\Psi_5"] \\
\tilde X_4 \arrow[r, "\tilde f_4"] & \tilde Y_4
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that the hypotheses of 2 of Remark 8.11 hold, and thus the conclusions of the theorem hold.

□

Theorem 9.3. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is pre-τ-quasi-well-prepared (τ-well prepared) with relation R and R' is a restriction of R with $U(R') = G_Y(f,\tau) - \Theta(f,Y)$. Then there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared) diagram of R*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that Φ_1, Ψ_1 are products of blow ups of possible centers and f_1 is τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared) with respect to the transform $(R^1)'$ of R'. Further, there exists a finite set of points $\Omega = \{q_1, \dots, q_r\} \subset Y$ such that f_1 is toroidal on $f_1^{-1}(Y_1 - \Psi_1^{-1}(\Omega))$, and $\Psi_1 \circ f_1(T((R^1)')) \subset U(R')$.

Proof. Let $C \subset Y$ be the union of the one dimensional components in the fundamental locus of f which contain a 1-point. By Lemma 5.12, there exists a Zariski open subset $\overline{Y}$ of Y such that $\overline{Y} \cap G_Y(f,\tau) = \Theta(f,Y)$, $\overline{Y}$ contains a generic point of each component of C, and there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{X}_n \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_n"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_n"'] & \overline{Y}_n \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_n"] \\
\overline{X}_{n-1} \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_{n-1}"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_{n-1}"'] & \overline{Y}_{n-1} \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_{n-1}"] \\
\vdots \arrow[d] & \vdots \arrow[d] \\
\overline{X}_1 \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_1"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_1"'] & \overline{Y}_1 \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_1"] \\
\overline{f}^{-1}(\overline{Y}) = \overline{X} \arrow[r, "\overline{f}"] & \overline{Y}
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\overline{f}_n$ is toroidal, each $\overline{\Psi}_i$ is the blow up of a nonsingular curve γ_i (in the fundamental locus of $\overline{f}_{i-1}$) dominating a component of C, and $\overline{\Phi}_i$ is a sequence of blow ups of nonsingular curves dominating γ_i. Further, we can choose $\overline{Y}$ so that $\overline{f}_n$ is τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared) for the transform of the restriction of R to $\overline{Y}$.

We have that $q \in (C - \Theta(f,Y)) \cap G_Y(f,\tau)$ implies $q \in U(R')$.

We apply Theorem 9.2 to C. We construct a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared (τ-well prepared) diagram of R. Let R^1 be the transform of R on X_1, and let $(R^1)'$ be the transform of R' on X_1 (which is a restriction of R^1). Let the diagram be

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y, \end{tikzcd}$$

which, after possibly replacing $\overline{Y}$ with a proper open subset of $\overline{Y}$, restricts to

$$\begin{tikzcd} \overline{X}_1 \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_1"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_1"'] & \overline{Y}_1 \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_1"] \\ \overline{X} \arrow[r, "\overline{f}"] & \overline{Y} \end{tikzcd}$$

over $\overline{Y}$ and such that $G_{Y_1}(f_1,\tau) \subset U((R^1)') \cup \Phi_1^{-1}(f^{-1}(\Theta(f,Y)))$. We iterate this construction for the Zariski closure of γ_i in Y_i, using Theorem 9.2 if γ_i contains a 1-point, and Lemma 8.1 if γ_i is a 2-curve, for $2 \le i \le n$, to achieve the conclusions of the theorem. □

Theorem 9.4. *Suppose that $f : X \to Y$ is τ-prepared. Then there exists a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

such that Φ and Ψ are products of possible blow ups, and there exists a relation R^1 for f_1 such that f_1 is τ-quasi-well prepared with relation R^1.

Proof. We will give an inductive construction. The set $G_Y(f,\tau) - \Theta(f,Y)$ is finite by Remark 5.16. Suppose that there exists a relation R on X such that $\Omega = U(R) \subset G_Y(f,\tau) - \Theta(f,Y)$. (Initially, $\Omega = \emptyset$). Let $\Lambda(Y) = G_Y(f,\tau) - \Theta(f,Y) - \Omega$.

Remark 5.9, Lemma 8.5 and Lemma 8.1 imply there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared diagram (for R)

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

obtained by blowing up 2-curves such that if $q_1 \in \Psi_1^{-1}(\Lambda(Y))$, then there exist algebraic permissible parameters u_1, v_1, w_1 at q_1 such that if $p_1 \in f_1^{-1}(q_1) \cap G_{X_1}(f_1,\tau)$, then there exist good parameters $u_1, v_1, w_1 - \phi_{p_1}(u_1,v_1)$ at p_1 for f_1.

We have $\Psi_1^{-1}(\Theta(f,Y)) \cap G_{Y_1}(f_1,\tau) \subset \Theta(f_1,Y_1)$. Let R^1 be the transform of R on X_1. We restrict R^1 by removing from $U(R^1)$ the points of $\Theta(f_1,Y_1)$, so that $U(R^1) \cap \Theta(f_1,Y_1) = \emptyset$. Let $\Omega_1 = U(R^1)$, a finite set of points (by Remark 5.16). We also have that a general point of each curve contained in $G_{Y_1}(f_1,\tau)$ is in $\Theta(f_1,Y_1)$, since f_1 is τ-prepared. Let

$$\Lambda(Y_1) = G_{Y_1}(f_1,\tau) - \Theta(f_1,Y_1) - \Omega_1 \subset \Psi_1^{-1}(\Lambda(Y)).$$

$\Lambda(Y_1)$ is a finite set of points. By Lemma 5.10, and our construction of f_1, for each $q \in \Lambda(Y_1)$, we can associate algebraic permissible parameters

$$u_q, v_q, w_q \tag{197}$$

at q, locally closed subsets $A_1, \ldots, A_{n(q)}$ of $f_1^{-1}(q) \cap G_{X_1}(f_1,\tau)$ such that $\{A_1, \ldots, A_{n(q)}\}$ is a partition of $f_1^{-1}(q) \cap G_{X_1}(f_1,\tau)$, and permissible parameters

$$u_q, v_q, w_{qi} = w_q - \phi_i(u_q, v_q)$$

at q for $1 \le i \le n(q)$ such that for $p_1 \in A_i$, w_{qi} is good at p_1 for f_1. We can assume that $u_q = v_q = 0$ are local equations of a general curve through q on D_Y if q is a 1-point (by Bertini's Theorem and Remark 5.9).

Now fix $q \in \Lambda(Y_1)$. By Theorem 9.1, applied to u_q, v_q, w_{qi} for $1 \le i \le n(q)$, there exists an affine neighborhood V_q of q and a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{X} \arrow[r, "\overline{f}"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}"'] & \overline{Y} \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}"] \\
f_1^{-1}(V_q) \arrow[r] & V_q
\end{tikzcd} \tag{198}$$

satisfying the conclusions of Theorem 9.1 for all w_{qi}. If $\overline{q} \in \overline{\Psi}^{-1}(q)$, then there exist $\overline{u}, \overline{v} \in \mathcal{O}_{\overline{Y},q}$ such that $\overline{u}, \overline{v}, w_i$ are permissible parameters at $\overline{q}$, $\overline{u}, \overline{v}, w_i$ are super parameters at $\overline{q}$ for all i, and by 3 of Lemma 8.1 and 5 of Lemma 8.4, for

$$p \in \overline{f}^{-1}(\overline{q}) \cap G_{\overline{X}}(\overline{f}, \tau) \cap \overline{\Phi}^{-1}(A_i),$$

w_i is good at p.

Observe that we can modify the construction of (179) in Theorem 9.1, by a diagram (180), by performing an arbitrary sequence of blow ups of 2-curves above each V_i and W_i before constructing V_{i+1} and W_{i+1}.

Suppose that our fixed $q \in \Lambda(Y_1)$ is 1-point. Recall that we have chosen u_q, v_q, w_{qi} so that $u_q = v_q = 0$ are local equations of a general curve C on D_{Y_1} through q, so that C makes SNCs with D_{Y_1}, C intersects 2-curves of Y_1 at general points, and $C - \{q\}$ intersects the fundamental locus γ of f_1 transversally at general points of irreducible 1-dimensional components of γ. Thus we have $G_{Y_1}(f_1, \tau) \cap (C - \{q\}) \subset \Theta(f_1, Y_1)$ and C intersects $\Theta(f_1, Y_1)$ transversally at general points of curves in $G_{Y_1}(f_1, \tau)$. For $\overline{q} \in G_{Y_1}(f_1, \tau) \cap (C - \{q\})$, there exist algebraic permissible parameters

$$u_{\overline{q}}, v_{\overline{q}}, w_{\overline{q}}$$

at the 1-point $\overline{q}$ such that $u_{\overline{q}} = v_{\overline{q}} = 0$ are local equations of C, and since $\overline{q}$ is perfect for f, there exist series $\phi_i(u_{\overline{q}}, v_{\overline{q}}) \in \mathbf{k}[[u_{\overline{q}}, v_{\overline{q}}]]$ such that $u_{\overline{q}}, v_{\overline{q}}, w_{\overline{q}i} = w_{\overline{q}} - \phi_i$ are super parameters at $\overline{q}$ for all i, and for $p \in f_1^{-1}(\overline{q})$, some $w_{\overline{q}i}$ is weakly good at p.

Now by Lemma 5.10, for $\overline{q} \in G_{Y_1}(f_1, \tau) \cap (C - \{q\})$, there exist locally closed subsets $V_i \subset X_1$ for $1 \le i \le n(\overline{q})$ such that $f_1^{-1}(\overline{q}) \cap G_{X_1}(f_1, \tau)$ is the disjoint union of $V_1, \ldots, V_{n(\overline{q})}$, and for $p \in V_i$, $w_{\overline{q}i}$ is weakly good for f_1 at p.

By Lemma 5.3 and Remark 8.2, there exists a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves $\hat{\Phi} : \hat{X} \to X_1$ with induced pre-τ-quasi-well prepared morphism $\hat{f} = f \circ \hat{\Phi} : \hat{X} \to Y_1$ such that for all $\overline{q} \in G_{Y_1}(f_1, \tau) \cap (C - \{q\})$, if $p \in \hat{f}^{-1}(\overline{q})$, then for all i, $u_{\overline{q}}, v_{\overline{q}}, w_{\overline{q}i}$ are super parameters at p and if $\tau_{\hat{f}}(p) > 0$, then $w_{\overline{q}i} = 0$ is a local equation of a divisor supported on $D_{\hat{X}}$ at p. Further, if $p \in \hat{\Phi}^{-1}(V_i) \cap G_{\hat{X}}(\hat{f}, \tau)$, then $w_{\overline{q}i}$ is weakly good for $\hat{f}$ at p.

We define new primitive relations $R^1_{\overline{q},i}$ for the finitely many

$$\overline{q} \in G_{Y_1}(\hat{f}, \tau) \cap (C - \{q\}) \subset G_{Y_1}(f_1, \tau) \cap (C - \{q\})$$

and $1 \le i \le n(\overline{q})$.

Let $U(R^1_{\overline{q},i}) = \{\overline{q}\}$, $T(R^1_{\overline{q},i}) = \hat{\Phi}^{-1}(V_i) \cap G_{\hat{X}}(\hat{f}, \tau)$.

Suppose that $\tau > 0$.

If $p \in V_i$ is a 1-point, then we have an expression

$$u_{\overline{q}} = x^a, v_{\overline{q}} = y, w_{\overline{q}i} = x^c \gamma$$

where x, y, z are regular parameters in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{X},p}$, $\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{X},p}$ is a unit series and $a \not| c$. Let $d = \gcd(a, c) < a$, $e = \frac{a}{d} > 1$ and $\overline{c} = \frac{c}{d}$.

We define $R^1_{\overline{q},i}(p) = w^e_{\overline{q}i} - \gamma(0,0,0)^e u^{\overline{c}}_{\overline{q}}$.

If $p \in V_i$ is a 2-point, then we have an expression

$$u_{\overline{q}} = (x^a y^b)^k, v_{\overline{q}} = z, w_{\overline{q}i} = (x^a y^b)^l \gamma$$

where x, y, z are regular parameters in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{X},p}$, $\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{X},p}$ is a unit series and $k \not| l$. Let $d = \gcd(k,l) < k$, $e = \frac{k}{d} > 1$ and $\overline{c} = \frac{l}{d}$. We define $R^1_{\overline{q},i}(p) = w^e_{\overline{q}i} - \gamma(0,0,0)^e u^{\overline{c}}_{\overline{q}}$.

Suppose that $\tau = 0$. We then define $R^1_{\overline{q},i}(p)$ by the relation $w_{\overline{q}i} = 0$ for $p \in V_i$ (by Remark 5.8).

We extend the transform $\hat{R}^1$ of R^1 on $\hat{X}$ to include the primitive relations $R^1_{\overline{q},i}$ for $\overline{q} \in G_{Y_1}(\hat{f},\tau) \cap (C - \{q\})$ which we have just defined. Observe that we now have

$$(C - \{q\}) \cap G_{Y_1}(\hat{f},\tau) \subset U(\hat{R}^1).$$

By embedded resolution of plane curve singularities (c.f. Section 3.4 and Exercise 3.13 [C6]), and Lemmas 8.6 and 8.8, there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\tilde{X} \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}"] \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Phi}"'] & \tilde{Y} \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Psi}"] \\
\hat{X} \arrow[r, "\hat{f}"] & Y_1
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that $\tilde{\Psi}$ is a sequence of blow ups of prepared 1-points and 2-points (of types 4 and 1 of Definition 7.5) such that if $\tilde{C}$ is the strict transform of C on $\tilde{Y}$, then $\tilde{C} \cap G_{\tilde{Y}}(f,\tau) = \{q\}$ (since the germ of C at $\overline{q} \in G_{Y_1}(f_1,\tau) \cap (C - \{q\})$ is not contained in the surface germ $w_{\overline{q}i} = 0$ for any i). Thus $\tilde{C}$ satisfies 1 and 2 of Definition 7.4 of a resolving curve. 4 of the definition holds since f_1 is τ-prepared and C intersects the fundamental curve of Y_1 transversally at general points.

By Lemma 5.6 [C5] and Lemma 8.1, there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\tilde{X}_2 \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}_2"] \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Phi}_2"'] & \tilde{Y}_2 \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Psi}_2"] \\
\tilde{X} \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}"] & \tilde{Y}
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\tilde{\Psi}_2$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_2$ are products of blow ups of 2-curves such that the strict transform $\tilde{C}_2$ of C satisfies 3 of Definition 7.4. Observe that $\tilde{\Psi} \circ \Psi_2$ is an isomorphism over q, and $\tilde{X}_2 \to X_1$ is a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves over $f_1^{-1}(q)$ Thus $\tilde{C}_2$ is a resolving curve for $\tilde{f}_2$ at q.

We may identify q with a point of $\tilde{Y}_2$. Let $\Phi' : \tilde{X}_2 \to X_1$ be our morphism $\Phi' = \hat{\Phi} \circ \tilde{\Phi} \circ \tilde{\Phi}_2$. Let $\tilde{A}_i = (\Phi')^{-1}(A_i) \cap G_{\tilde{X}_2}(\tilde{f}_2,\tau)$ for $1 \le i \le n(q)$. We have that u_q, v_q, w_{qi} are permissible parameters at q such that w_{qi} is good for $\tilde{f}_2$ at all $p \in \tilde{A}_i$ (by Remark 8.2).

After possibly replacing the neighborhood V_q of q in (198) with a smaller neighborhood of q, we may identify V_q with a neighborhood of q in $\tilde{Y}_2$.

Let

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_2 \arrow[r, "f_2"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_2"'] & Y_2 \arrow[d, "\Psi_2"] \\
\tilde{X}_2 \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}_2"] & \tilde{Y}_2
\end{tikzcd}$$

be the pre-τ-quasi-well prepared diagram of the conclusions of Lemma 8.4, where Ψ_2 is the blow up of $\tilde{C}_2$.

As $(f_1\circ\Phi')^{-1}(V_q)\rightarrow f_1^{-1}(V_q)$ is a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves, as commented after the construction of (198), we can assume that if we restrict the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_2 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\Phi''"'] & Y_2 \arrow[d, "\Psi''"] \\
X_1 \arrow[r] & Y_1
\end{tikzcd}$$

that we have constructed to V_q, we obtain the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
W_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_1"'] & V_1 \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_1"] \\
f_1^{-1}(V_q)=W \arrow[r] & V=V_q
\end{tikzcd}$$

of (180) constructed in the proof of Theorem 9.1.

Now suppose that our fixed $q\in\Lambda(Y_1)$ is a 2-point. Then, by Lemma 8.1 we construct a τ-quasi-well prepared diagram for R^1 and the blow up Ψ'' of C

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_2 \arrow[r, "f_2"] \arrow[d, "\Phi''"'] & Y_2 \arrow[d, "\Psi''"] \\
X_1 \arrow[r] & Y_1
\end{tikzcd}$$

where Φ'' is a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves.

We can assume that if we restrict the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_2 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y_2 \arrow[d] \\
X_1 \arrow[r] & Y_1
\end{tikzcd}$$

to V_q, we obtain the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
W_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}_1"'] & V_1 \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}_1"] \\
f_1^{-1}(V_q)=W \arrow[r] & V=V_q
\end{tikzcd}$$

of (180) constructed in the proof of Theorem 9.1.

Let R^2 be our relation on X_2. We have (by Remark 8.2)

$$(\Psi'')^{-1}(\Theta(f_1,Y_1)-C)\subset\Theta(f_2,Y_2).$$

We restrict R^2 if necessary, so that $U(R^2)\cap\Theta(f_2,Y_2)=\emptyset$. Let $\Omega_2=U(R^2)$

With the notation of the proof of Theorem 9.1, let C_2 be the Zariski closure of γ_1, the curve blown up in $V_2\rightarrow V_1$, in Y_2. C_2 is a section over C. Either C_2 is a 2-curve or C_2 contains a 1-point.

Suppose that C_2 contains a 1-point. Then $q_1=(\Psi'')^{-1}(q)\cap C_2$ is a 1-point.

In this case, by 4 of the conclusions of Lemma 8.4, at all 1-points $\overline{q}_1\in C_2$, there exist permissible parameters u_1,v_1,w such that $u_1=v_1=0$ are local equations of C_2 at $\overline{q}_1$, and u_1,v_1 are toroidal forms at all $p\in f_2^{-1}(\overline{q}_1)$. Thus C_2 satisfies 2 and 4 of Definition 7.4 of a resolving curve for f_2 at q_1.

We can apply Lemma 8.9 to construct a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_3 \arrow[r, "f_3"] \arrow[d] & Y_3 \arrow[d] \\
X_2 \arrow[r, "f_2"] & Y_2
\end{tikzcd} \tag{199}$$

satisfying the conclusions of Lemma 8.9, so that the strict transform of C_2 is a resolving curve for f_3 at q_1.

The vertical arrows of (199) are products of blow ups of 2-curves above V_q.

Let

$$\begin{tikzcd}X_4 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\Phi_4"'] & Y_4 \arrow[d, "\Psi_4"] \\ X_3 \arrow[r] & Y_3\end{tikzcd}$$

be the pre-τ-quasi-well prepared diagram of the conclusions of Lemma 8.4, where Ψ_4 is the blow up of the strict transform of C_2.

Suppose that C_2 is a 2-curve. Then we construct (from Lemma 8.1)

$$\begin{tikzcd}X_4 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y_4 \arrow[d] \\ X_2 \arrow[r] & Y_2\end{tikzcd} \tag{200}$$

as a τ-quasi-well prepared diagram for R^2 and the blow ups of C_2.

As commented after the construction of (198), we may assume that the diagram (200) restricts to the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}W_2 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & V_2 \arrow[d] \\ W_1 \arrow[r] & V_1\end{tikzcd}$$

of (180) above V_q.

Since (180) is finite, after finitely many iterations, we achieve a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}X_5 \arrow[r, "f_5"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_5"'] & Y_5 \arrow[d, "\Psi_5"] \\ X_1 \arrow[r] & Y_1\end{tikzcd}$$

which restricts to the diagram (198) above V_q, Ψ_5 is an isomorphism over $\Lambda(Y_1)-\{q\}$ and Φ_5 is a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves over $\Lambda(Y_1)-\{q\}$.

By Lemma 5.3, and Remark 8.2, 3 of Lemma 8.1 and 5 of Lemma 8.4, there exists a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves $\Phi_6 : X_6 \rightarrow X_5$ such that $f_6 : X_6 \rightarrow Y_5$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared, and (with the notation introduced with (198)), there exist algebraic permissible parameters $u_q, v_q, w_q \in \mathcal{O}_{Y_1,q}$ and $w_{qi} = w_q - \phi_i(u_q, v_q)$ such that for $\overline{q}$ in the finite set

$$\Sigma = (\Psi_5 \circ \Psi_6)^{-1}(q) \cap G_{Y_5}(f_6, \tau) - \Theta(f_6, Y_5),$$

we have algebraic permissible parameters $u_{\overline{q}}, v_{\overline{q}}, w_q$ at $\overline{q}$, and series

$$\overline{\phi}_i(u_{\overline{q}}, v_{\overline{q}}) = \phi_i(u_q, v_q)$$

such that $u_{\overline{q}}, v_{\overline{q}}, w_{qi} = w_q - \overline{\phi}_i(u_{\overline{q}}, v_{\overline{q}})$ are super parameters for all i, and for

$$p \in V_{\overline{q}i} = f_6^{-1}(\overline{q}) \cap (\Phi_5 \circ \Phi_6)^{-1}(A_i) \cap G_{X_6}(f_6, \tau),$$

$w_{\overline{q}i} = w_q - \overline{\phi}_i(u_{\overline{q}}, v_{\overline{q}})$ is good for f_6 at p, and $w_{\overline{q}i} = 0$ is supported on D_{X_6} at p if $\tau > 0$.

We define new primitive relations $R^6_{\overline{q},i}$ for $\overline{q} \in \Sigma$ and $1 \le i \le n(q)$.

Let $U(R^6_{\overline{q},i}) = \{\overline{q}\}$, $T(R^6_{\overline{q},i}) = V_{\overline{q}i}$.

Suppose that $\tau > 0$.

If $p \in V_{\overline{q}i}$ is a 1-point, then we have an expression

$$u_{\overline{q}} = x^a, v_{\overline{q}} = y, w_{\overline{q}i} = x^c\gamma$$

where x, y, z are regular parameters in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_6,p}$, $\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_6,p}$ is a unit series and $a \not| c$.

Let

$$a' = \frac{a}{\gcd(a,c)} > 1, \ \ c' = \frac{c}{\gcd(a,c)}.$$

We define $R^6_{\overline{q},i}(p) = w_{\overline{q}i}^{a'} - \gamma(0,0,0)^{a'} u_{\overline{q}}^{c'}$.

If $p\in V_i$ is a 2-point, then we have an expression

$$u_{\overline{q}}=(x^ay^b)^k, v_{\overline{q}}=z, w_{\overline{q}i}=(x^ay^b)^l\gamma$$

where x,y,z are regular parameters in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_6,p}$, $\gamma\in\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_6,p}$ is a unit series and $k\not| l$.

Let

$$k'=\frac{k}{\gcd(k,l)}>1,\ \ l'=\frac{l}{\gcd(k,l)}.$$

We define $R^6_{\overline{q},i}(p)=w_{\overline{q}i}^{k'}-\gamma(0,0,0)^{k'}u_{\overline{q}}^{l'}$.

Suppose that $\tau=0$. We then define $R^6_{\overline{q},i}(p)=w_{\overline{q}i}$. By Remark 5.8, $w_{\overline{q}i}$ is a monomial form at p.

We can extend the transform R^6 of R^5 on X_6 to include these new primitive relations $R^6_{\overline{q},i}$.

We now restrict R^6 to remove the points of $\Theta(f_6,Y_5)$ from $U(R^6)$. We have a natural identification

$$\Lambda(Y_6)=G_{Y_5}(f_6,\tau)-\Theta(f_6,Y_5)-U(R^6)$$

with $\Lambda(Y_1)-\{q\}$, by our construction, and since $Y_6\to Y_1$ is an isomorphism over $\Lambda(Y_1)-\{q\}$.

By induction on $|\Lambda(Y_1)|$, we may iterate the above procedure to construct a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_7 \arrow[r, "f_7"] \arrow[d] & Y_7 \arrow[d] \\
X \arrow[r] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that f_7 is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared with $U(R^7)=G_{Y_7}(f_7,\tau)-\Theta(f_7,Y_7)$.

Now by Theorem 9.3 there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well diagram for R^7

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_8 \arrow[r, "f_8"] \arrow[d] & Y_8 \arrow[d] \\
X_7 \arrow[r] & Y_7
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that f_8 is τ-quasi-well prepared for the transform of R^7. □

Lemma 9.5. *Suppose that* $\tau\ge 0$, $f:X\to Y$ *is* τ*-quasi-well prepared with relation* R*. Further suppose there exists a* τ*-quasi-well prepared diagram for* R

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\tilde{X} \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}"] \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Phi}"'] & \tilde{Y} \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Psi}"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y,
\end{tikzcd} \tag{201}$$

where $\tilde{R}$ *is the transform of* R *on* $\tilde{X}$*, such that if* $q_1\in U(\tilde{R})$ *is on a component* E *of* $D_{\tilde{Y}}$ *such that* $\tilde{\Psi}(E)$ *is not a point, then* $T(\tilde{R})\cap\tilde{f}^{-1}(q_1)=\emptyset$*. Then there exists a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\
\tilde{X} \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}"] & \tilde{Y}
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that Φ, Ψ *are products of blow ups of possible centers, and* f_1 *is* τ*-quasi-well prepared with relation* R^1 *and pre-algebraic structure. Further,* R^1 *is algebraic. (*R^1 *will in general not be the transform of* $\tilde{R}$*.)*

Proof. Given a diagram (201), we will define a new relation $\tilde{R}'$ on $\tilde{X}$ for $\tilde{f}$. This is accomplished as follows. We have that $\mid U(\tilde{R})-\Theta(\tilde{f},\tilde{Y})\mid<\infty$ by Remark 5.16. Suppose that $q_1\in U(\tilde{R})-\Theta(\tilde{f},\tilde{Y})$ is such that $\tilde{f}^{-1}(q_1)\cap T(\tilde{R})\neq\emptyset$. Let

$$J_{q_1}=\{i\mid T(\tilde{R}_i)\cap\tilde{f}^{-1}(q_1)\neq\emptyset\}.$$

Let $q=\tilde{\Psi}(q_1)$. For $j\in J_{q_1}$, let

$$u=u_{\overline{R}_j(q)},v=v_{\overline{R}_j(q)},w_j=w_{\overline{R}_j(q)}.$$

Let

$$u_1=u_{\overline{\tilde{R}_j(q_1)}},v_1=v_{\overline{\tilde{R}_j(q_1)}},w_{j,1}=w_{\overline{\tilde{R}_j(q_1)}}.$$

Since $\tilde{\Psi}$ is a composition of admissible blow ups for the transforms of the pre-relations $\overline{R}_i$ on Y, by the description of admissible blow ups (118) - (120) following Definition 6.2, we have in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y_1,q}$, one of the following relations: q_1 a 2-point

$$u=u_1^{\tilde{a}}v_1^{\tilde{b}},v=u_1^{\tilde{c}}v_1^{\tilde{d}},w_j=u_1^{\tilde{e}}v_1^{\tilde{f}}w_{j,1}\tag{202}$$

with $\tilde{a}\tilde{d}-\tilde{b}\tilde{c}=\pm1$, or q_1 a 1-point,

$$u=u_1,v=u_1^{\tilde{c}}v_1,w_j=u_1^{\tilde{e}}w_{j,1}\tag{203}$$

or q_1 a 1-point

$$u=u_1^{\tilde{a}}\gamma_1(u_1,v_1),v=u_1^{\tilde{b}}\gamma_2(u_1,v_1),w_j=u_1^{\tilde{c}}\gamma_3(u_1,v_1)w_{j,1}\tag{204}$$

where $\gamma_1,\gamma_2,\gamma_3$ are unit series and $\gamma_1,\gamma_2,\gamma_3\in\mathcal{O}_{Y_1,q}$ or q_1 a 2-point

$$u=(u_1^{\tilde{a}}v_1^{\tilde{b}})^{\tilde{t}}\gamma_1(u_1,v_1),v_1=(u_1^{\tilde{c}}v_1^{\tilde{d}})^{\tilde{k}}\gamma_2(u_1,v_1),w_j=u_1^{\tilde{e}}v_1^{\tilde{f}}\gamma_3(u_1,v_1)w_{j,1}\tag{205}$$

where $\gamma_1,\gamma_2,\gamma_3$ are unit series, and $\gamma_1,\gamma_2,\gamma_3\in\mathcal{O}_{Y_1,q}$, $\tilde{a},\tilde{b}>0$.

By assumption, if q_1 is on a component E of $D_{\tilde{Y}}$ we must have $\tilde{\Psi}(E)$ is a point. Thus in (202) we have $\tilde{a},\tilde{b},\tilde{c},\tilde{d},\tilde{e},\tilde{f}$ all nonzero. If (203) holds, we have $\tilde{c},\tilde{e}>0$. In (204) we have $\tilde{a},\tilde{b},\tilde{c}>0$. In (205) we have $\tilde{t},\tilde{k},\tilde{e},\tilde{f}>0$.

Suppose that $p_1\in T(\tilde{R}_j)\cap\tilde{f}^{-1}(q_1)$ and $\tau>0$. Let $p=\tilde{\Phi}(p_1)\in T(R_j)$. On X_1, $w_j=0$ is a divisor supported on D_{X_1} at p_1. In (202), (204), (205) we see that $u=0$ is a local equation of D_{X_1} at p_1, and $v=0$ is a local equation of D_{X_1} at p_1. In (203), we have that $u=0$ is a local equation of D_{X_1} at p_1, $w_j=0$ is a local equation of D_{X_1} at p_1, and $v=0$ is a local equation of a divisor that contains D_{X_1} at p_1. Thus in all cases, there exists a natural number r such that w_j divides u^r and v^r in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\tilde{X},p_1}$.

Define

$$\eta=\eta(q_1)=\begin{cases}\max\{2r^2,\tilde{e},\tilde{f}\} & \text{if (202) or (205) holds}\\ \max\{2r^2,\tilde{c}\} & \text{if (204) holds}\\ \max\{2r^2,\tilde{e}\} & \text{if (203) holds}\end{cases}$$

where the maximum is over $p_1\in T(\tilde{R}_j)\cap\tilde{f}^{-1}(q_1)$.

Fix $j\in J_{q_1}$. There exists $\sigma(u,v,w_j)\in\mathbf{k}[[u,v,w_j]]=\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y,q}$ such that the order of the series σ is greater than η and $w_j+\sigma\in\mathcal{O}_{Y,q}$. Let

$$w_j^*=w_j+\sigma(u,v,w_j).$$

For $p_1\in T(\tilde{R}_j)\cap\tilde{f}^{-1}(q_1)$, we have

$$w_j^*=w_j\gamma_{p_1j}$$

where $\gamma_{p_1j}\in\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_1,p_1}$ is a unit series. If (202) holds at q_1, set

$$w_{q_1,j}=\frac{w_j^*}{u_1^{\tilde e}v_1^{\tilde f}}=w_{j,1}+\frac{\sigma(u_1^{\tilde a}v_1^{\tilde b},u_1^{\tilde c}v_1^{\tilde d},u_1^{\tilde e}v_1^{\tilde f}w_{j,1})}{u_1^{\tilde e}v_1^{\tilde f}}\in\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\tilde Y,q_1}\cap\mathbf{k}(Y)=\mathcal{O}_{\tilde Y,q_1},\tag{206}$$

since $u_1,v_1\in\mathcal{O}_{\tilde Y,q_1}$ (this is part of the definition of a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared morphism).

We further have

$$w_{q_1,j}=w_{j,1}\gamma_{p_1,j}.$$

There is a similar argument if (203), (204) or (205) holds.

For $k\in J_{q_1}$, there exists $\lambda_{jk}(u,v)\in\mathbf{k}[[u,v]]$ such that $w_k=w_j+\lambda_{jk}(u,v)$. Write

$$\lambda_{jk}(u,v)=\alpha_k(u,v)+h_k(u,v)$$

where $\alpha_k(u,v)$ is a polynomial, and $h_k(u,v)$ is a series of order greater than η. Set

$$w_k^*=w_j+\sigma(u,v,w_j)+\lambda_{jk}(u,v)-h_k(u,v)\in\mathcal{O}_{Y,q}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}w_k^*&=w_k+\sigma(u,v,w_k-\lambda_{jk}(u,v))-h_k(u,v)\\&=w_k+\overline{\sigma}_k(u,v,w_k)\end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{\sigma}_k$ is a series of order greater than η.

Suppose that (202) holds at q_1. Set

$$w_{q_1,k}=\frac{w_k^*}{u_1^{\tilde e}v_1^{\tilde f}}.$$

From (202) we see that $u_1,v_1,w_{q_1,k}$ are permissible parameters at q_1 and

$$w_k=u_1^{\tilde e}v_1^{\tilde f}w_{q_1,k},$$

so that $w_{q_1,k}\in\mathcal{O}_{\tilde Y,q_1}$. We further have that

$$w_{q_1,k}=w_{k,1}\gamma_{p_1k}\tag{207}$$

for some unit series $\gamma_{p_1k}\in\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\tilde X_1,p_1}$.

We have that for $k\in J_{q_1}$,

$$w_{q_1,k}=w_{k,1}+\frac{\overline{\sigma}_k(u_1^{\tilde a}v_1^{\tilde b},u_1^{\tilde c}v_1^{\tilde d},u_1^{\tilde e}v_1^{\tilde f}w_{k,1})}{u_1^{\tilde e}v_1^{\tilde f}}\tag{208}$$

with

$$\frac{\overline{\sigma}_k}{u_1^{\tilde e}v_1^{\tilde f}}\in\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\tilde Y,q_1}.$$

We further have

$$w_{q_1,k}-w_{q_1,j}=\frac{w_k^*-w_j^*}{u_1^{\tilde e}v_1^{\tilde f}}=\frac{\lambda_{jk}(u,v)-h_k(u,v)}{u_1^{\tilde e}v_1^{\tilde f}}\in\mathbf{k}((u_1,v_1))\cap\mathbf{k}[[u_1,v_1,w_{j,1}]]=\mathbf{k}[[u_1,v_1]].$$

There is a similar argument if (203), (204) or (205) holds. In these cases (206) becomes:

$$w_{q_1j}=\frac{w_j^*}{u_1^{\tilde e}},w_{q_1j}=\frac{w_j^*}{u_1^{\tilde c}},w_{q_1j}=\frac{w_j^*}{u_1^{\tilde e}v_1^{\tilde f}}$$

respectively.

In all these cases, an equation (207) holds.

In case (203), a variant of equation (208) holds.

Suppose that (205) holds and $k \in J_{q_1}$. Then there exist series $\overline{\sigma}_k(u,v,w_k)$ such that ord $\overline{\sigma}_k > \eta$ and such that

$$w_k^* = w_k + \overline{\sigma}_k(u,v,w_k).$$

Thus

$$w_{q_1,k} = \gamma_3(u_1,v_1)w_{k,1} + \frac{\overline{\sigma}_k((u_1^{\tilde{a}}v_1^{\tilde{b}})^{\tilde{t}}\gamma_1(u_1,v_1),(u_1^{\tilde{c}}v_1^{\tilde{d}})^{\tilde{k}}\gamma_2(u_1,v_1),u_1^{\tilde{e}}v_1^{\tilde{f}}\gamma_3(u_1,v_1)w_{j,1})}{u_1^{\tilde{e}}v_1^{\tilde{f}}} \tag{209}$$

with

$$\frac{\overline{\sigma}_k}{u_1^{\tilde{e}}v_1^{\tilde{f}}} \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\tilde{Y},q_1}.$$

There is a similar expression if (204) holds.

Now suppose that $\tau = 0$. We make the same argument as the $\tau > 0$ case if $w_{j,1}$ satisfies a form of Definition 3.4 with $\alpha \neq 0$. A similar, but slightly different argument is required if w_{j1} satisfies 1, 2 or 5 of Definition 3.4, with $\alpha = 0$.

We now define the new relation $\tilde{R}'$ on $\tilde{X}$ for $\tilde{f}$. Set $T(\tilde{R}') = T(\tilde{R}) - \tilde{f}^{-1}(\Theta(\tilde{f},\tilde{Y}))$, $U(\tilde{R}') = \tilde{f}(T(\tilde{R})) - \Theta(\tilde{f},\tilde{Y})$. $U(\tilde{R}')$ is a finite set by Remark 5.16. For $q_1 \in U(\tilde{R}')$, we define primitive relations $R_{q_1,k}$ as follows. Set $U(R_{q_1,k}) = \{q_1\}$, $T(R_{q_1,k}) = T(\tilde{R}_k) \cap \tilde{f}^{-1}(q_1)$.

For $p_1 \in T(R_{q_1,k})$ define

$$u_{R_{q_1,k}(p_1)} = u_{\tilde{R}_k(p_1)}, v_{R_{q_1,k}(p_1)} = v_{\tilde{R}_k(p_1)}, w_{R_{q_1,k}(p_1)} = w_{q_1,k}.$$

If $\tau > 0$ and q_1 is a 2-point (from 207), we define $R_{q_1,k}(p_1)$ by

$$a_{R_{q_1,k}}(p_1) = a_{\tilde{R}_k}(p_1), b_{R_{q_1,k}}(p_1) = b_{\tilde{R}_k}(p_1), e_{R_{q_1,k}}(p_1) = e_{\tilde{R}_k}(p_1)$$

and

$$\lambda_{R_{q_1,k}}(p_1) = \lambda_{\tilde{R}_k}(p_1)\gamma_{p_1k}(0,0,0)^{e_{\tilde{R}_k}(p_1)}.$$

If $\tau = 0$, and q_1 is a 2-point, we define

$$a_{R_{q_1,k}}(p_1) = b_{R_{q_1,k}}(p_1) = \infty.$$

If q_1 is a 1-point, we define $R_{q_1,k}(p_1)$ in an analogous way.

From the above calculations, we see that $f : \tilde{X} \to \tilde{Y}$ with the relation $\tilde{R}'$ satisfies 1 - 3 of the conditions of Definition 7.1 of a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared morphism.

Recall that all exponents are positive in (202) - (205), and thus in (208) and (209). Thus we can choose a possibly larger $\eta(q_1)$ so that ord(σ_k) is sufficiently large in (208) and (209) that $\tilde{R}'$ satisfies 4 of the conditions of Definition 7.1 (as well as $1-3$). Thus $\tilde{f}$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared with respect to $\tilde{R}'$.

For $q_i \in U(R_{q_i,k})$, let $\Omega(R_{q_i,k})$ be an affine neighborhood of q_i on the surface with local equation $w_{q_i,k} = 0$ at q_i, such that

1. $\Omega(R_{q_i,k})$ is nonsingular and makes SNCs with $D_{\tilde{Y}}$.
2. $\Omega(R_{q_i,k}) \cap U(\tilde{R}') = \{q_i\}$

We now restrict $\tilde{R}'$ so that $U(\tilde{R}') = G_{\tilde{Y}}(\tilde{f},\tau) - \Theta(\tilde{f},\tilde{Y})$, $\tilde{f}$ is pre-τ-quasi-well prepared with relation $\tilde{R}'$ and $\tilde{R}'$ is algebraic.

By Theorem 9.3 there exists a pre-τ-quasi-well prepared diagram for $\tilde{R}'$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X' \arrow[r, "f'"] \arrow[d, "\Phi'"'] & Y' \arrow[d, "\Psi'"] \\
\tilde{X} \arrow[r] & \tilde{Y}
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that f' is τ-quasi-well prepared for the transform R' of $\tilde R'$. By our construction, R' has pre-algebraic structure. Further, R' is algebraic. Thus the conclusions of Lemma 9.5 hold. $\square$

Remark 9.6. *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is τ-quasi-well prepared and $q \in U(\overline{R}_i)$ is a 1-point. Let*

$$u = u_{\overline{R}_i(q)}, v = v_{\overline{R}_i(q)}, w_i = w_{\overline{R}_i(q)}.$$

Then f is not toroidal above q if and only if q is contained in the fundamental locus of f.

Suppose that f is not toroidal above q. Then the germ of the fundamental locus of f at q is a nonsingular (algebraic) curve, and $u = w_i = 0$ are (formal) local equations of the fundamental locus of f at q.

Proof. Suppose that f is not toroidal above q. u, v, w_i are super parameters at p for all $p \in f^{-1}(q)$. From consideration of the local forms 5 and 6 of Definition 5.1 of super parameters at a 1-point q, we see that $u = w_i = 0$ are local equations of (a formal branch of) the fundamental locus of f at q. Since the fundamental locus of f is algebraic, we obtain the conclusions of the remark. $\square$

Theorem 9.7. *Suppose that $\tau \geq 0$, $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is τ-quasi-well prepared with relation R. Then there exists a τ-quasi-well prepared diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\tilde X \arrow[r, "\tilde f"] \arrow[d, "\tilde\Phi"'] & \tilde Y \arrow[d, "\tilde\Psi"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\tilde R$ is the transform of R on $\tilde X$ such that if $q_1 \in U(\tilde R)$ is on a component E of $D_{\tilde Y}$ such that $\tilde\Psi(E)$ is not a point, then $T(\tilde R) \cap \tilde f^{-1}(q_1) = \emptyset$.

Proof. **Step 1.** Let A_0 be the set of 2-points $q \in Y$ such that $q \in U(\overline{R}_i)$ for some $\overline{R}_i$ associated to R and $f^{-1}(q) \cap T(R_i) \neq \emptyset$. A_0 is a finite set since f is τ-prepared.

For $q \in A_0 \cap U(\overline{R}_i)$, set

$$u = u_{\overline{R}_i(q)}, v = v_{\overline{R}_i(q)}, w_i = w_{\overline{R}_i(q)}. \tag{210}$$

Let $\Psi_1 : Y_1 \rightarrow Y$ be the blowup of all $q \in A_0$, and let

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

be a τ-quasi-well prepared diagram of R and Ψ_1. Such a diagram exits by Lemma 8.6. Suppose that $q \in A_0 \cap U(\overline{R}_i)$ and $q_1 \in \Psi_1^{-1}(q)$ is a 1-point lying on a component E of D_{Y_1} and $f_1^{-1}(q_1) \cap T(\overline{R}_i^1) \neq \emptyset$. Then q_1 has regular parameters $u_1, v_1, w_{i,1}$ with

$$u = u_1, v = u_1(v_1 + \alpha), w_i = u_1 w_{i,1}$$

with $0 \neq \alpha \in \mathbf{k}$, which implies that E has local equation $u_1 = 0$, so that $\Psi_1(E)$ is a point.

Let A_1 be the set of all 2-points $q_1 \in Y_1$ such that for some i, $q_1 \in U(\overline{R}_i^1)$, $f_1^{-1}(q_1) \cap T(R_i^1) \neq \emptyset$ and q_1 is on a component E of D_{Y_1} such that $\Psi_1(E)$ is not a point. We have $A_1 \subset \Psi_1^{-1}(A_0)$. Let $\Psi_2 : Y_2 \rightarrow Y_1$ be the blowup of all $q_1 \in A_1$, and let (by Lemma 8.6)

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_2 \arrow[r, "f_2"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_2"'] & Y_2 \arrow[d, "\Psi_2"] \\
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] & Y_1
\end{tikzcd}$$

be a τ-quasi-well prepared diagram of R^1 and Ψ_2. Continue in this way to construct (for arbitrary n) a sequence of n blow ups of sets of 2-points $\Psi_{k+1} : Y_{k+1} \rightarrow Y_k$ for $0 \le k \le n-1$ with τ-quasi-well prepared diagrams

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_{k+1} \arrow[r, "f_{k+1}"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_{k+1}"'] & Y_{k+1} \arrow[d, "\Psi_{k+1}"] \\
X_k \arrow[r, "f_k"] & Y_k
\end{tikzcd}$$

of R^k and Ψ_{k+1}. We have a resulting τ-quasi-well prepared diagram of R

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_n \arrow[r, "f_n"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_n \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{211}$$

Suppose that $q_n \in Y_n$ is a 2-point such that q_n is on a component E of D_{Y_n} such that $\Psi(E)$ is not a point, and $q_n \in U(\overline{R}_i^n)$, $f_n^{-1}(q_n) \cap T(R_i^n) \neq \emptyset$ for some i. We have permissible parameters

$$u_1 = u_{\overline{R}_i^n(q_n)}, v_1 = v_{\overline{R}_i^n(q_n)}, w_{i,1} = w_{\overline{R}_i^n(q_n)} \tag{212}$$

at q_n such that for $\Psi(q_n) = q$ and with notation of (210),

$$\begin{aligned}
u &= u_1 \\
v &= u_1^n v_1 \\
w_i &= u_1^n w_{i,1}
\end{aligned} \tag{213}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned}
u &= u_1 v_1^n \\
v &= v_1 \\
w_i &= v_1^n w_{i,1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $p \in T(R_i) \cap f^{-1}(q)$ is a 1-point. First suppose that $\tau > 0$. There are permissible parameters x, y, z at p and $0 \neq \alpha \in \mathbf{k}$, where $\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ is a unit, such that we have

$$u = x^a, v = x^b(\alpha + y), w = x^c \gamma.$$

From the construction of (211) and the algorithm of Lemma 8.6, we have that Φ is an isomorphism at points of $\Phi^{-1}(p) \cap f_n^{-1}(q_n)$. Thus for $n \ge \max\{\frac{a}{b}, \frac{b}{a}\}$, $f_n^{-1}(q_n) \cap \Phi^{-1}(p) = \emptyset$.

Suppose that $\tau = 0$ (and $p \in T(R_i) \cap f^{-1}(q)$ is a 1-point). Then there exist permissible parameters x, y, z at p, $\beta \in \mathbf{k}$, and $0 \neq \alpha \in \mathbf{k}$ such that

$$u = x^a, v = x^b(\alpha + y), w = x^c(\beta + z).$$

If $\beta \neq 0$, then Φ is an isomorphism at points of $\Phi^{-1}(p) \cap f_n^{-1}(q_n)$. For $n \ge \max\{\frac{a}{b}, \frac{b}{a}\}$, we have $f_n^{-1}(q_n) \cap \Phi^{-1}(p) = \emptyset$.

If $\beta = 0$, then Φ is a product of blow ups of sections over the curve $x = z = 0$ at points of $f_n^{-1}(q_n)$, and in this case also, $\Phi^{-1}(p) \cap f_n^{-1}(q_n) = \emptyset$ for $n \ge \max\{\frac{a}{b}, \frac{b}{a}\}$.

Suppose that $p\in T(R_i)\cap f^{-1}(q)$ is a 2-point. First suppose that $\tau>0$. There are permissible parameters x,y,z at p and $0\ne\alpha\in\mathbf{k}$ such that we have one of the forms

$$u=(x^ay^b)^k, v=(x^ay^b)^t(\alpha+z), w_i=(x^ay^b)^l\gamma, \tag{214}$$

where $0\ne\alpha\in\mathbf{k}$, $\gcd(a,b)=1$, $\gamma\in\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ is a unit,

or we have

$$u=x^ay^b, v=x^cy^d, w_i=x^ey^f\gamma \tag{215}$$

where $ad-bc\ne 0$, $\gamma\in\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ is a unit.

Suppose that (214) holds. From the construction of (211) and the algorithm of Lemma 8.6, we have that Φ is a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves at points of $\Phi^{-1}(p)\cap f_n^{-1}(q_n)$, so that for $n\ge\max\{\frac{k}{t},\frac{t}{k}\}$, $f_n^{-1}(q_n)\cap\Phi^{-1}(p)=\emptyset$,

Suppose that (215) holds. If $f_n^{-1}(q_n)\cap\Phi^{-1}(p)\cap T(R_i^n)\ne\emptyset$ for all n, we will show that, after possibly interchanging u,v and x,y, (215) must be

$$u=x^a, v=x^cy^d, w_i=x^ey^f\gamma, \tag{216}$$

with $d,f>0$, and (213) holds.

We see this as follows.

Suppose that $p_n\in f_n^{-1}(q_n)\cap T(R_i^n)$ and $\Phi(p_n)=p$.

Let ν be a valuation of $\mathbf{k}(X)$ whose center on X_n is p_n. We identify ν with an extension of ν to the quotient field of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_n,p_n}$ which dominates $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_n,p_n}$. q_n has permissible parameters (212). After possibly interchanging u and v, we have a relation (213), so that $\nu(v)>n\nu(u)$, and $\nu(w_i)>n\nu(u)$. We can reindex x,y,z so that $0<\nu(x)\le\nu(y)$. Then

$$(c+d-nb)\nu(y)\ge(d-nb)\nu(y)+(c-na)\nu(x)>0,$$

and

$$(e+f-nb)\nu(y)\ge(f-nb)\nu(y)+(e-na)\nu(x)>0. \tag{217}$$

Thus if $b\ne 0$, and $n>c+d$, we have a contradiction.

Taking $n>c+d$ for all c,d in local forms (215) for 2-points $p\in T(R)$, we achieve that $b=0$ in all local forms (215) which are the images of 2-points $p_n\in T(R^n)$ which map to a point q_n of Y_n which is on a component E of D_{Y_n} such that $\Psi(E)$ is not a point. $d>0$ since $ad-bc\ne 0$.

We have $f>0$ if $n>>0$. In fact, if $f=0$ in (215), we then have $e>0$, and for $n>\frac{a}{e}$, we have a contradiction to (217).

Suppose that $\tau=0$ (and $p\in T(R_i)\cap f^{-1}(q)$ is a 2-point). Then there exist permissible parameters x,y,z at p and $0\ne\alpha\in\mathbf{k}$ such that we have one of the forms:

$$u=(x^ay^b)^k, v=(x^ay^b)^t(\alpha+z), w_i=x^cy^d \tag{218}$$

with $0\ne\alpha\in\mathbf{k}$, $ad-bc\ne 0$, $\gcd(a,b)=1$, or we have

$$u=x^ay^b, v=x^cy^d, w_i=x^ey^f(\beta+z) \tag{219}$$

with $ad-bc\ne 0$, $\beta\in\mathbf{k}$.

Suppose that (218) holds. From the construction of (211), we have that Φ is a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves at points of $\Phi^{-1}(p)\cap f_n^{-1}(q_n)$, so that for $n\ge\max\{\frac{k}{t},\frac{t}{k}\}$, $f_n^{-1}(q_n)\cap\Phi^{-1}(p)=\emptyset$.

Suppose that (219) holds. If $\beta\ne 0$, the analysis of (215) shows that if $f_n^{-1}(q_n)\cap\Phi^{-1}(p)\cap T(R_i^n)\ne\emptyset$ for all n, then after possibly interchanging u,v and interchanging x,y (219) has the form (216), with $\gamma=\beta+z$, $d,f>0$ and (213) holds.

Suppose that $\beta=0$ (in (219)), and $f_n^{-1}(q_n)\cap\Phi^{-1}(p)\cap T(R_i^n)\ne\emptyset$ for all n. After possibly interchanging u and v, we may assume that (213) holds. Let ν be a valuation of $\mathbf{k}(X)$ whose center on X_n is p_n. We identify ν with an extension of ν to the quotient field of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_n,p_n}$ which dominates $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_n,p_n}$. Then we see that

$$\nu(v) > n\nu(u) \text{ and } \nu(w_i) > n\nu(u) \tag{220}$$

for all n.

Thus for n sufficiently large, after possibly interchanging x and y, (219) must be

$$u = x^a, v = x^c y^d, w_i = x^e y^f z \tag{221}$$

with $d > 0$.

We will now show that we can take n sufficiently large that $f > 0$ in (221).

Suppose that $f = 0$ in (221). Then we have

$$\nu(y) > n\nu(x) \text{ and } \nu(z) > n\nu(x) \tag{222}$$

for all n.

In the algorithm of Lemma 8.6 (explicitly worked out in Lemma 7.13 [C5]), we see that $\Phi_1 : X_1 \to X$ can be factored by morphisms

$$X_1 = Z_m \to \cdots \to Z_2 \to Z_1 \to X$$

where $Z_1 \to X$ is a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves and 3-points, and each $Z_{i+1} \to Z_i$ is the blow up of a possible curve containing a 1-point, which is in the locus where $\mathcal{I}_q\mathcal{O}_{Z_i}$ is not invertible.

By (222), we see that there exist permissible parameters $\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{y}_1, \tilde{z}_1$ at the center $\tilde{p}_1$ of ν on Z_1 such that

$$x = \tilde{x}_1, y = \tilde{x}_1^g \tilde{y}_1, z = \tilde{z}_1.$$

We have

$$u = \tilde{x}_1^a, v = \tilde{x}_1^{c+gd}\tilde{y}_1^d, w_i = \tilde{x}^e \tilde{z}_1$$

with $a \le c + gd$, since from the construction of $Z_1 \to X_1$, we have that $(u, v)\mathcal{O}_{Z_1,\tilde{p}_1}$ is invertible.

If $e \ge a$, then $\mathcal{I}_q\mathcal{O}_{Z_1,\tilde{p}_1}$ is invertible, and $X_1 \to Z_1$ is an isomorphism above $\tilde{p}_1$. Then at $p_1 \in X_1$, there are permissible parameters $\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1, \hat{z}_1$ such that

$$u_{\overline{R}_i^1(q_1)} = \hat{x}_1^a, v_{\overline{R}_i^1(q_1)} = \hat{x}_1^{c+gd-a}\hat{y}_1^d, w_{\overline{R}_i^1(q_1)} = \hat{x}_1^{e-a}\hat{z}_1.$$

If $e - a = 0$, we have that f_1 is toroidal at p_1 (so that $\tau_{f_1}(p_1) = -\infty$).

If $e < a$, we have that $X_1 \to Z_1$ is not an isomorphism above $\tilde{p}_1$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that each $Z_{i+1} \to Z_i$ is not an isomorphism at the center of ν.

We have that $\tilde{x}_1 = \tilde{z}_1 = 0$ are (formal) local equations at $\tilde{p}_1$ of the curve blown up in $Z_2 \to Z_1$.

Let $\tilde{p}_2$ be the center of ν on $\tilde{Z}_2$. By (222), we have that there are permissible parameters $\tilde{x}_2, \tilde{y}_2, \tilde{z}_2$ at $\tilde{p}_2$ such that $\tilde{x}_1 = \tilde{x}_2$, $\tilde{y}_1 = \tilde{y}_2$, $\tilde{z}_1 = \tilde{x}_2\tilde{z}_2$.

We have

$$u = \tilde{x}_2^a, v = \tilde{x}_2^{c+gd}\tilde{y}_2^d, w_i = \tilde{x}_2^{e+1}\tilde{z}_2.$$

We see that in $X_1 = Z_m$, there are regular parameters $\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1, \hat{z}_1$ such that

$$u_{\overline{R}_i^1(q_1)} = \hat{x}_1^a, v_{\overline{R}_i^1(q_1)} = \hat{x}_1^{c+gd-a}\hat{y}_1^d, w_{\overline{R}_i^1(q_1)} = \hat{z}_2.$$

thus f_1 is toroidal at p_1.

Iterating this analysis for the morphisms $\Psi_2, \ldots, \Psi_n$, we see that for $n >> 0$, f_n is toroidal at p_n. In fact, if we take $n \ge \frac{e}{a}$ in (211), we see that $f_n^{-1}(q_n) \cap T(R_i^n) \cap \Phi^{-1}(p) = \emptyset$.

We can thus take n sufficiently large so that $f > 0$ in all local forms (221), which are the images of 2-points $p_n \in T(R^n)$ which map to a point q_n of Y_n which is on a component E of D_{Y_n} such that $\Psi(E)$ is not a point.

Suppose that $p \in X$ is a 3-point such that $p \in T(R_i) \cap f^{-1}(q)$. Then there are permissible parameters x, y, z for u, v, w_i at p such that

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a y^b z^c \\ v &= x^d y^e z^f \\ w_i &= x^g y^h z^i \gamma \end{aligned} \tag{223}$$

where γ is a unit series.

We will show that we can choose n sufficiently large in the diagram (211), so that if $p_n \in X_n$ is a 3-point such that $p_n \in \Phi^{-1}(p) \cap T(R_i^n)$ and $q_n = f_n(p_n)$ is on a component E of D_{Y_n} such that $\Psi(E)$ is not a point, then (223) must have one of the following forms (after possibly interchanging u, v and x, y, z):

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a y^b \\ v &= x^d y^e z^f \\ w_i &= x^g y^h z^i \gamma \end{aligned} \tag{224}$$

where $b \neq 0$, $f \neq 0$, $i \neq 0$ and (213) holds, or

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a \\ v &= x^d y^e z^f \\ w_i &= x^g y^h z^i \gamma \end{aligned} \tag{225}$$

with e and $f \neq 0$, h or $i \neq 0$ and (213) holds.

We will now prove this statement.

Let ν be any valuation of $\mathbf{k}(X)$ which has center p_n on X_n. We identify ν with an extension of ν to the quotient field of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_n,p_n}$ which dominates $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_n,p_n}$.

q_n has permissible parameters (212).

After possibly interchanging u and v, we have a relation (213), so that $\nu(v) > n\nu(u)$. We can reindex x, y, z so that

$$0 < \nu(x) \leq \nu(y) \leq \nu(z).$$

Then

$$(f + e + d - nc)\nu(z) \geq (f - nc)\nu(z) + (e - nb)\nu(y) + (d - na)\nu(x) > 0.$$

If $c \neq 0$, and $n > f + e + d$, we have a contradiction. Thus taking $n > f + e + d$ for all d, e, f in local forms (223) for 3-points $p \in T(R)$, we achieve that $c = 0$ in all local forms (223) which are the images of 3-points $p_n \in T(R^n)$ which map to a point q_n of Y_n which is on a component E of D_{Y_n} such that $\Psi(E)$ is not a point.

If $i = 0$ (and $c = 0$) in (223) we have

$$(h + g - nb)\nu(y) \geq (h - nb)\nu(y) + (g - na)\nu(x) > 0$$

so that if $b \neq 0$ and $n > h + g$ we have a contradiction. Thus, by taking $n \gg 0$ in (211), we see that if $b \neq 0$, then a form (224) must hold at p (since $uv = 0$ is a local equation of D_X at p implies $f \neq 0$). If $b = c = 0$ in (223), then a similar calculation shows that a form (225) must hold at p (for $n \gg 0$).

We observe that in (224) we have

$$(z) \cap \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y,q} = (v, w_i). \tag{226}$$

Suppose that (225) holds. If $i \neq 0$ then

$$(z) \cap \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y,q} = (v, w_i). \tag{227}$$

If $h \ne 0$, then

$$(y) \cap \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y,q} = (v, w_i). \tag{228}$$

Suppose that (216) or (221) hold. Then

$$(y) \cap \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y,q} = (v, w_i). \tag{229}$$

We will show that in (224), $v = w_i = 0$ is a formal branch of an algebraic curve C in the fundamental locus of $f : X \to Y$. Let $R = \mathcal{O}_{Y,q}$, $S = \mathcal{O}_{X,p}$.

Since p is a 3-point, there exist regular parameters $\overline{x}, \overline{y}, \overline{z}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{X,p}$ and units $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ such that $\overline{x} = x\lambda_1$, $\overline{y} = y\lambda_2$, $\overline{z} = z\lambda_3$.

$\overline{z} = 0$ is a local equation for a component of D_X. We have that $v \in (\overline{z}) \cap R$ and $u \notin (\overline{z}) \cap R$ so that $(\overline{z}) \cap R = (v)$ or $(\overline{z}) \cap R = a$ where a is a height two prime containing v. We have $(z\hat{S}) \cap \hat{R} = (v, w_i)$. Suppose that $(\overline{z}) \cap R = (v)$. We then have an induced morphism

$$\hat{R}/(v) \to \hat{S}/(z)$$

which is an inclusion by the Zariski Subspace Theorem (Theorem 10.14 [Ab3]). This is impossible, so that a is a height 2 prime in R, and defines a curve C, which is necessarily in the fundamental locus of f since $\overline{z} = 0$ is a local equation at p of a component of D_X which dominates C. A similar argument shows that in (225), (216) and (221), $v = w_i = 0$ is a formal branch of an algebraic curve C in the fundamental locus of f.

Step 2. Let C be the reduced curve in Y whose components are the curves in the fundamental locus of f which are not 2-curves. Let $\overline{C}$ be the reduced curve in Y_n which is the strict transform of C. The components of $\overline{C}$ are then in the fundamental locus of f_n. By Theorem 9.2, we can perform a sequence of blow ups of prepared 1-points, prepared 2-points, 2-curves and resolving curves $\Psi' : Y' \to Y_n$ so that we can construct a τ-quasi-well prepared diagram of Ψ' and R^n

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X' \arrow[r, "f'"] \arrow[d, "\Phi'"'] & Y' \arrow[d, "\Psi'"] \\
X_n \arrow[r] & Y_n
\end{tikzcd} \tag{230}$$

where R' is the transform of R^n on X', such that the strict transform $\tilde{C}$ of $\overline{C}$ on Y' is nonsingular, and makes SNCs with $D_{Y'}$. If $q' \in U(R'_i) \cap \tilde{C}$ for some i then the germ at q' of $\tilde{C}$ is contained in $S_{R'_i}(q')$, and the (disjoint) components of $\tilde{C}$ are permissible centers for R'.

Let $\Psi(1) : Y(1) \to Y'$ be the blow up of $\tilde{C}$. By Theorem 9.2, we have a τ-quasi-well prepared diagram of $\Psi(1)$ and R'

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X(1) \arrow[r, "f(1)"] \arrow[d, "\Phi(1)"'] & Y(1) \arrow[d, "\Psi(1)"] \\
X' \arrow[r, "f'"] & Y'.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{231}$$

Let $R(1)$ be the transform of R' on $X(1)$.

Suppose that $q \in U(R) \subset Y$ is a 2-point. Suppose that $\tilde{q} \in (\Psi \circ \Psi')^{-1}(q)$ and $(f')^{-1}(\tilde{q}) \cap T(R'_i) \ne \emptyset$. Then $q \in A_0$.

Let

$$\tilde{u} = u_{\overline{R}'_i(\tilde{q})}, \tilde{v} = v_{\overline{R}'_i(\tilde{q})}, \tilde{w}_i = w_{\overline{R}'_i(\tilde{q})},$$
$$u = u_{\overline{R}(q)}, v = v_{\overline{R}(q)}, w_i = w_{\overline{R}_i(q)}.$$

We have (since $q \in A_0$ and $\Psi \circ \Psi'$ is a sequence of blow ups of points and 2-curves at $\tilde{q}$) one of the following forms (by (118) - (120):

$$u = \tilde{u}^a\tilde{v}^b, v = \tilde{u}^c\tilde{v}^d, w_i = \tilde{u}^l\tilde{v}^m\tilde{w}_i \tag{232}$$

with $ad - bc = \pm 1$ and $l > 0$ if $c > 0$, $m > 0$ if $b > 0$, or

$$u = (\tilde{u}^a\tilde{v}^b)^t\gamma_1(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}), v = (\tilde{u}^a\tilde{v}^b)^k\gamma_2(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}), w_i = \tilde{u}^e\tilde{v}^f\tilde{w}_i\gamma_3(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \tag{233}$$

where $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ are unit series, $a, b, t, k, e, f > 0$, $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, or

$$u = \tilde{u}^a\gamma_1(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}), v = \tilde{u}^b\gamma_2(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}), w_i = \tilde{u}^c\tilde{w}_i\gamma_3(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \tag{234}$$

where $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ are unit series, $a, b, c > 0$.

We have that $(\Psi \circ \Psi')(E) = q$ for all components E of $D_{Y'}$ containing $\tilde{q}$ (which implies $\tilde{q} \notin \tilde{C}$) unless $\tilde{q}$ is a 2-point, and we have an expression

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \tilde{u}\\ v &= \tilde{u}^c\tilde{v}\\ w_i &= \tilde{u}^l\tilde{v}^m\tilde{w}_i \end{aligned} \tag{235}$$

with $c, l > 0$ or

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \tilde{u}\tilde{v}^b\\ v &= \tilde{v}\\ w_i &= \tilde{u}^l\tilde{v}^m\tilde{w}_i \end{aligned}$$

with $b, m > 0$.

Let $q^* = \Psi'(\tilde{q})$. q^* is a 2-point and $f^{-1}(q^*) \cap T(R_i') \neq \emptyset$. After possibly interchanging u and v we have that a form (213) holds at q, and thus by (226) - (229) that $v = w_i = 0$ are local equations of a formal component of C at q. (235) thus holds at $\tilde{q}$, and since Ψ' is a sequence of blow ups of points and 2-curves at $\tilde{q}$, $m = 0$ in (235). We thus have an expression

$$u = \tilde{u}, v = \tilde{u}^e\tilde{v}, w_i = \tilde{u}^f\tilde{w}_i \tag{236}$$

for some $e, f > 0$. $\tilde{v} = 0$ is a local equation of the strict transform of D_Y at $\tilde{q}$, and $\tilde{v} = \tilde{w}_i = 0$ are local equations of $\tilde{C}$ at $\tilde{q}$ since $\tilde{C}$ is nonsingular.

Suppose that $\overline{q} \in (\Psi \circ \Psi' \circ \Psi(1))^{-1}(q)$ and $f(1)^{-1}(\overline{q}) \cap T(R_i(1)) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\tilde{q} = \Psi(1)(\overline{q})$. then $(f')^{-1}(\tilde{q}) \cap T(R_i') \neq \emptyset$. If $\tilde{q} \notin \tilde{C}$ (so that $\overline{q} = \tilde{q}$) then we have seen that $(\Psi \circ \Psi')(E) = q$ for all components E of $D_{Y'}$ containing $\tilde{q}$. Suppose that $\tilde{q} \in \tilde{C}$. Then an expression (236) holds at $\tilde{q}$.

$\Psi(1)$ is the blow up of $\tilde{v} = \tilde{w}_i = 0$ above $\tilde{q}$. Since $\overline{q} \in U(R_i(1))$, we must have

$$\tilde{u} = u_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}, \tilde{v} = v_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}, \tilde{w}_i = v_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}w_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}.$$

Substituting into (236), we have

$$u = u_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}, v = u^e_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}v_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}, w_i = u^f_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}v_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}w_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})} \tag{237}$$

with $e, f \geq 1$.

Suppose that $q \in U(R) \subset Y$ is a 1-point. Then Ψ is an isomorphism over q. Suppose that $\tilde{q} \in (\Psi \circ \Psi')^{-1}(q)$ and $(f')^{-1}(\tilde{q}) \cap T(R_i') \neq \emptyset$. Let

$$\tilde{u} = u_{\overline{R}_i'(\tilde{q})}, \tilde{v} = v_{\overline{R}_i'(\tilde{q})}, \tilde{w}_i = w_{\overline{R}_i'(\tilde{q})},$$

$$u = u_{\overline{R}_i(q)}, v = v_{\overline{R}_i(q)}, w_i = w_{\overline{R}_i(q)}.$$

We have that $u = w_i = 0$ are local equations of C since $T(R_i) \cap f^{-1}(q) \neq \emptyset$, by Remark 9.6. Then Ψ' is either an isomorphism at $\tilde{q}$, or factors at $\tilde{q}$ as the blow up of q, followed by a sequence of blow ups of 2-points and 2-curves.

First suppose that Ψ' is not an isomorphism at $\tilde{q}$. We have one of the following forms (by (118) - (120):

$$u = \tilde{u}^a\tilde{v}^b, v = \tilde{u}^c\tilde{v}^d, w_i = \tilde{u}^l\tilde{v}^m\tilde{w}_i \tag{238}$$

with $ad - bc = \pm 1$ and $l > 0$ if $c > 0$, $m > 0$ if $b > 0$, or

$$u = (\tilde{u}^a\tilde{v}^b)^t\gamma_1(\tilde{u},\tilde{v}), v = (\tilde{u}^a\tilde{v}^b)^k\gamma_2(\tilde{u},\tilde{v}), w_i = \tilde{u}^e\tilde{v}^f\tilde{w}_i\gamma_3(\tilde{u},\tilde{v}) \tag{239}$$

where $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ are unit series, $a, b, t, k, e, f > 0$, $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, or

$$u = \tilde{u}^a\gamma_1(\tilde{u},\tilde{v}), v = \tilde{u}^b\gamma_2(\tilde{u},\tilde{v}), w_i = \tilde{u}^c\tilde{w}_i\gamma_3(\tilde{u},\tilde{v}) \tag{240}$$

where $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ are unit series, $a, b, c > 0$.

We have that $\Psi'(E) = q$ for all components E of $D_{Y'}$ containing $\tilde{q}$, (which implies $\tilde{q} \notin \tilde{C}$) unless we have an expression

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \tilde{u}\tilde{v}^b\\ v &= \tilde{v}\\ w_i &= \tilde{u}^l\tilde{v}^m\tilde{w}_i \end{aligned} \tag{241}$$

with $b, m > 0$.

Since Ψ' is an isomorphism over a generic point of every component of C, we have that $\tilde{q}$ is a 2-point and

$$u = \tilde{u}\tilde{v}^m, v = \tilde{v}, w_i = \tilde{v}^n\tilde{w}_i \tag{242}$$

with $m, n \geq 1$. $\tilde{u} = \tilde{w}_i = 0$ are local equations of $\tilde{C}$ at $\tilde{q}$.

Suppose that $\overline{q} \in (\Psi \circ \Psi' \circ \Psi(1))^{-1}(q)$ and $f(1)^{-1}(\overline{q}) \cap T(R_i(1)) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\tilde{q} = \Psi(1)(\overline{q})$. then $(f')^{-1}(\tilde{q}) \cap T(R'_i) \neq \emptyset$. If $\tilde{q} \notin \tilde{C}$ (so that $\overline{q} = \tilde{q}$) then we have seen that $(\Psi \circ \Psi')(E) = q$ for all components E of $D_{Y'}$ containing $\tilde{q}$. Suppose that $\tilde{q} \in \tilde{C}$. Then an expression (242) holds at $\tilde{q}$. Then $\overline{q}$ is a 2-point with

$$\tilde{u} = u_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}, \tilde{v} = v_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}, \tilde{w}_i = u_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}w_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})},$$

and thus

$$u = u_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}v^m_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}, v = v_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}, w_i = u_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}v^n_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}w_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})} \tag{243}$$

with $m, n \geq 1$.

Now suppose that Ψ' is an isomorphism over q ($q \in U(R)$ is a 1-point), and $\overline{q} \in \Psi(1)^{-1}(q)$ is such that $f(1)^{-1}(q) \cap T(R_i(1)) \neq \emptyset$. then $\overline{q}$ is a 1-point, and (by Remark 9.6)

$$u = u_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}, v = v_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}, w_i = u_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}w_{\overline{R}_i(1)(\overline{q})}. \tag{244}$$

Step 3. We now apply steps 1 and 2 of the proof to $f(1) : X(1) \to Y(1)$ and $R(1)$. We construct a τ-quasi-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} X(2) \arrow[r, "f(2)"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}(2)"'] & Y(2) \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}(2)"] \\ X(1) \arrow[r, "f(1)"] & Y(1), \end{tikzcd}$$

where $R(2)$ is the transform of $R(1)$ on $X(2)$. Suppose that $q_2 \in U(R_i(2)) \subset Y(2)$ is on a component E_2 of $D_{Y(2)}$ such that $\Psi \circ \Psi' \circ \Psi(1) \circ \overline{\Psi}(2)(E_2)$ is not a point of Y and there exists a point $p_2 \in f(2)^{-1}(q_2) \cap T(R_i(2)) \subset X(2)$. Let $q_1 = \overline{\Psi}(2)(q_2)$. $\overline{\Psi}_2(2)(E_2)$ is necessarily not a point of $Y(1)$.

Suppose that q_1 is a 2-point. Then we have an expression (analogous to (237)):

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\overline{R_i}(1)(q_1)} &= u_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} \\ v_{\overline{R_i}(1)(q_1)} &= u^{e}_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} v_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} \\ w_{\overline{R_i}(1)(q_1)} &= u^{f}_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} v_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} w_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} \end{aligned} \tag{245}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\overline{R_i}(1)(q_1)} &= u_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} v^{e}_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} \\ v_{\overline{R_i}(1)(q_1)} &= v_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} \\ w_{\overline{R_i}(1)(q_1)} &= u_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} v^{f}_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} w_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} \end{aligned} \tag{246}$$

with $e, f \ge 1$.

Let $q = (\Psi \circ \Psi' \circ \Psi(1))(q_1)$. Since q_1 lies on a component E_1 of $D_{Y(1)}$ which does not contract to a point of Y, and $f(1)^{-1}(q_1) \cap T(R_i(1)) \ne \emptyset$, a form (237) or (243) holds for

$$u = u_{\overline{R_i}(q)}, v = v_{\overline{R_i}(q)}, w_i = w_{\overline{R_i}(q)}$$

and

$$u_{\overline{R_i}(1)(q_1)}, v_{\overline{R_i}(1)(q_1)}, w_{\overline{R_i}(1)(q_1)}.$$

Suppose that (237) holds at q_1. Substituting (245) and (246) into (237), we see that since q_2 is on a component E_2 of $D_{Y(2)}$ which does not contract to q, then we have that (245) holds, and an expression

$$\begin{aligned} u = u_{R_i(q)} &= u_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} \\ v = v_{R_i(q)} &= u^{e_2}_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} v_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} \\ w = w_{R_i(q)} &= u^{f_2}_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} v^{2}_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} w_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} \end{aligned} \tag{247}$$

with $e_2, f_2 \ge 2$.

Suppose that (243) holds at q_1. Substituting (245) or (246) into (243), we see that since q_2 is on a component of $D_{Y(2)}$ which does not contract to q, we have that (246) holds we have and an expression

$$u = u_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} v^{e_2}_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)}, v = v_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)}, w_i = u^{2}_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} v^{f_2}_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} w_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} \tag{248}$$

with $e_2, f_2 \ge 2$.

Suppose that q_1 is a 1-point. Then we have an expression (analogous to (243))

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\overline{R_i}(1)(q_1)} &= u_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} v^{m}_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)}, \\ v_{\overline{R_i}(1)(q_1)} &= v_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)}, \\ w_{\overline{R_i}(1)(q_1)} &= u_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} v^{n}_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} w_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} \end{aligned} \tag{249}$$

with $m, n \ge 1$, or (analogous to (244))

$$u_{\overline{R_i}(1)(q_1)} = u_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)}, v_{\overline{R_i}(1)(q_1)} = v_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)}, w_{\overline{R_i}(1)(q_1)} = u_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)} w_{\overline{R_i}(2)(q_2)}. \tag{250}$$

Since q_1 lies on a component E_1 of $D_{Y(1)}$ which does not contract to a point of Y, and $f(1)^{-1}(q_1) \cap T(R_i(1)) \ne \emptyset$, a form (244) holds at q_1 for

$$u = u_{\overline{R_i}(q)}, v = v_{\overline{R_i}(q)}, w_i = w_{\overline{R_i}}(q)$$

and

$$u_{\overline{R}_1(1)(q_1)}, v_{\overline{R}_i(1)(q_1)}, w_{\overline{R}_i(1)(q_1)}.$$

Substituting (249) and (250) into (244), we see that since q_1 is on a component E_1 of $D_{Y(1)}$ which does not contract to q, we have

$$u = u_{\overline{R}_i(2)(q_2)} v^m_{\overline{R}_i(2)(q_2)}, v = v_{\overline{R}_i(2)(q_2)}, w_i = u^2_{\overline{R}_i(2)(q_2)} v^n_{\overline{R}_i(2)(q_2)} w_{\overline{R}_i(2)(q_2)} \tag{251}$$

with $m, n \geq 0$.

Iterating steps 1 and 2, we construct a sequence of τ-quasi-well prepared diagrams

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\vdots \arrow[d] & \vdots \arrow[d] \\
X(n) \arrow[r, "f(n)"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}(n)"'] & Y(n) \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}(n)"] \\
X(n-1) \arrow[r, "f(n-1)"] \arrow[d] & Y(n-1) \arrow[d] \\
\vdots \arrow[d] & \vdots \arrow[d] \\
X(1) \arrow[r, "f(1)"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}(1)"'] & Y(1) \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}(1)"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{252}$$

We continue this algorithm as long as there exists $q_n \in U(R_i(n))$ for some i such that q_n is on a component E of $D_{Y(n)}$ which does not contract to a point of Y, and $f(n)^{-1}(q_n) \cap T(R_i(n)) \neq \emptyset$.

Step 4. Suppose that the algorithm never terminates.

Let ν be a 0-dimensional valuation of $\mathbf{k}(X)$. We will say that ν is resolved on $X(n)$ if the center of ν on $X(n)$ is at a point p_n of $X(n)$ such that either $p_n \notin T(R(n))$ or $p_n \in T(R(n))$ and all components E of $D_{Y(n)}$ containing $q_n = f(n)(p_n)$ contract to a point of Y.

By our construction, if ν is resolved on $X(n)$, then ν is resolved on $X(m)$ for all $m \geq n$. Further, the set of ν in the Zariski-Riemann manifold $\Omega(X)$ of X [Z] which are resolved on X is an open subset of $\Omega(X)$.

Suppose that ν is a 0-dimensional valuation of $\mathbf{k}(X)$ such that ν is not resolved on $X(n)$ for all n. Let p_n be the center of ν on $X(n)$, q_n be the center of ν on $Y(n)$.

For all n, we identify ν with an extension of ν to the quotient field of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_n,p_n}$ which dominates $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_n,p_n}$.

First suppose that the center of ν on Y is a 2-point.

There exists an i such that for all n, $q_n \in U(R_i(n))$ and $p_n \in f(n)^{-1}(q_n) \cap T(R_i(n))$. We have expressions (after possibly interchanging u and v)

$$\begin{aligned}
u = u_{\overline{R}_i(q)} &= u_{\overline{R}_i(n)(q_n)} \\
v = v_{\overline{R}_i(q)} &= u^{e_n}_{\overline{R}_i(n)(q_n)} v_{\overline{R}_i(n)(q_n)} \\
w = w_{\overline{R}_i(q)} &= u^{f_n}_{\overline{R}_i(n)(q_n)} v^n_{\overline{R}_i(n)(q_n)} w_{\overline{R}_i(n)(q_n)}
\end{aligned} \tag{253}$$

with $e_n, f_n \geq n$ for all n.

From (253), we see that

$$\nu(v) > n\nu(u) \text{ for all } n \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{254}$$

Thus ν is a composite valuation, and there exists a prime ideal P of the valuation ring V of ν such that $v \in P$, $u \notin P$. Let ν_1 be a valuation whose valuation ring is V_P. We have $\nu_1(u) = 0$, $\nu_1(v) > 0$. From (253) we see that

$$\nu_1(w) > n\nu_1(v) > 0 \tag{255}$$

for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$.

At $p = p_0 \in X$, we have a form (216), (221), (224) or (225). In (216) we have $\nu_1(x) = 0$ and $d > 0$, a contradiction to (255). In (224) we have $\nu_1(y) = 0$. $uv = 0$ is a local equation of D_X at p. Thus either $a > 0$ or $d > 0$. If $a > 0$ then $\nu_1(x) = 0$ and $\nu_1(z) > 0$, a contradiction to (255) since $f \neq 0$. If $d > 0$, we again have a contradiction to (255). In (225) we have a contradiction to (255), since $\nu_1(x) = 0$ and $e, f > 0$.

Suppose that (221) holds. In this case a more detailed analysis is required. By our construction and with the notation of steps 1 and 2, there exists a factorization

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X(1) \arrow[r, "f(1)"] \arrow[d, "\Phi(1)"'] & Y(1) \arrow[d, "\Psi(1)"] \\
X' \arrow[r, "f'"] \arrow[d, "\Phi'"'] & Y' \arrow[d, "\Psi'"] \\
X_n \arrow[r, "f_n"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_n \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Recall that p_1 is the center of ν on $X(1)$, p is the center of ν on X, q_1 is the center of ν on $Y(1)$, and q is the center of ν on Y.

Let p' be the center of ν on X', q' be the center of ν on Y'.

At q', $Y' \rightarrow Y$ is a sequence of blow ups of prepared 2-points of type 1, and 2-curves, and at p',

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X' \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y' \arrow[d] \\
X \arrow[r] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

is obtained by iterating the constructions of Remark 8.3 and Lemma 8.6.

Let

$$u' = u_{\overline{R}'_i(q')}, v' = v_{\overline{R}'_i(q')}, w'_i = w_{\overline{R}'_i(q')}.$$

By equations (254), (255) and (221) we see that

$$\nu(y) > n\nu(x) \text{ and } \nu_1(x) = 0,\ \ \nu_1(z) > n\nu_1(y) \tag{256}$$

for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$.

We see (by a variant of the analysis of (221), using (256)), that there exist permissible parameters x', y', z' at p' such that

$$u' = (x')^a, v' = (x')^{c'}(y')^d, w'_i = (x')^{e'}(y')^f z'$$

where a, d, f are the constants of (221) and $c', e' \in \mathbf{N}$. $\Psi(1)$ is the blow up of the curve $\tilde{C}$ which has local equations $v' = w'_i = 0$ at q'. The construction of $X(1) \rightarrow X'$ (Remark 8.11) is analogous to the analysis of Lemma 8.4. There exists a factorization

$$X(1) = W_m \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow W_2 \rightarrow W_1 \rightarrow X'$$

where $W_1 \rightarrow X'$ is a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves and 3-points, and each $W_{i+1} \rightarrow W_i$ is a curve containing a 1-point in the locus where $\mathcal{I}_{\tilde{C}}\mathcal{O}_{W_i}$ is not invertible.

Let $\tilde{p}_i$ be the center of ν on W_i. By the analysis of the proof of Lemma 8.4, and (256), we see that there exist permissible parameters $\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{y}_1, \tilde{z}_1$ at $\tilde{p}_1$ such that

$$u' = \tilde{x}_1^a, v' = \tilde{x}_1^{c_1}\tilde{y}_1^d, w_i' = \tilde{x}_1^{e_1}\tilde{y}_1^f\tilde{z}_1$$

with $(c_1, d) \le (e_1, f)$, or $d \ge f$ and $(c_1, d) \not\le (e_1, f)$.

If $(c_1, d) \le (e_1, f)$, then $X(1) \rightarrow W_1$ is an isomorphism at p_1, and we have

$$u' = u_{\overline{R}_i(1)(q_1)}, v' = v_{\overline{R}_i(1)(q_1)}, w_i' = w_{\overline{R}_i(1)(q_1)}v_{\overline{R}_i(1)(q_1)}.$$

We have

$$u_{\overline{R}_i(1)(q_1)} = \tilde{x}_1^a, v_{\overline{R}_i(1)(q_1)} = \tilde{x}_1^{c_1}\tilde{y}_1^d, w_{\overline{R}_i(1)(q_1)} = \tilde{x}_1^{e_1-c_1}\tilde{y}_1^{f-d}\tilde{z}_1. \tag{257}$$

Suppose that $d \ge f$ and $(c, d) \not\le (e_1, f)$. We may assume without loss of generality that each $W_{i+1} \rightarrow W_i$ is not an isomorphism at the center of ν.

$W_2 \rightarrow W_1$ is the blow up of a curve which either has local equations

$$\tilde{x}_1 = \tilde{z}_1 = 0 \tag{258}$$

(and $c_1 > e_1$), or

$$\tilde{y}_1 = \tilde{z}_1 = 0 \tag{259}$$

(and $d > f$).

By (256), there exist permissible parameters $\tilde{x}_2, \tilde{y}_2, \tilde{z}_2$ at $\tilde{p}_2$ such that

$$\tilde{x}_1 = \tilde{x}_2, \tilde{y}_1 = \tilde{y}_2, \tilde{z}_1 = \tilde{x}_2\tilde{z}_2$$

if (258) holds,

$$\tilde{x}_1 = \tilde{x}_2, \tilde{y}_1 = \tilde{y}_2, \tilde{z}_1 = \tilde{y}_2\tilde{z}_2$$

if (259) holds.

We then have that

$$u' = \tilde{x}_2^a, v' = \tilde{x}_2^{c_1}\tilde{y}_2^d, w_i' = \tilde{x}_2^{e_1+1}\tilde{y}_2^f\tilde{z}_1$$

or

$$u' = \tilde{x}_2^a, v' = \tilde{x}_2^{c_1}\tilde{y}_2^d, w_i' = \tilde{x}_2^{e_1}\tilde{y}_2^{f+1}\tilde{z}_1.$$

By iteration of this analysis for local equations of $W_{i+1} \rightarrow W_i$, we see that at $p_1 = \tilde{p}_m$, we have permissible parameters $\tilde{x}_m, \tilde{y}_m, \tilde{z}_m$ such that

$$u' = \tilde{x}_m^a, v' = \tilde{x}_m^{c_1}\tilde{y}_m^d, w_i' = \tilde{x}_m^{e_1}\tilde{y}_m^d\tilde{z}_m$$

with $e_1 \ge c_1$.

We have

$$u_{\overline{R}_i(1)(q_1)} = \tilde{x}_m^a, v_{\overline{R}_i(1)(q_1)} = \tilde{x}_m^{c_1}\tilde{y}_m^d, w_{\overline{R}_i(1)(q_1)} = \tilde{x}_m^{e_1-c_1}\tilde{z}_m. \tag{260}$$

We see by the analysis of (221) that ν is resolved on $X(2)$ if (260) holds, so we must have that (257) holds at $\tilde{p}_1$. Observe that we must have a reduction $f_1 = f - d < f$ in (257) from (221).

iterating this analysis, we see that we must reach the case (260) after a finite number of iterations of step 2. This is a contradiction to the assumption that ν is never resolved on $X(n)$.

Now suppose that the center of ν on Y is a 1-point. Then there exists an i such that for all n, $q_n \in U(R_i(n))$ and $p_n \in f(n)^{-1}(q_n) \cap T(R_i(n))$, and either q_n is a 2-point for $n >> 0$ or q_n is a 1-point for all n.

$q = q_0 \in Y$ is a 1-point and $p = p_0 \in f^{-1}(q) \cap T(\overline{R}_i)$. Let

$$u = u_{\overline{R}_i(q)}, v = v_{\overline{R}_i(q)}, w = w_{\overline{R}_i(q)}.$$

If $\tau > 0$, there exist permissible parameters x, y, z at p such that one of the following forms hold: p a 1-point

$$u = x^a, v = y, w_i = x^b(\gamma(x,y) + x^{c-b}z) \tag{261}$$

where γ is a unit series or p a 2-point

$$u = (x^a y^b)^k, v = z, w_i = (x^a y^b)^t(\gamma(x^a y^b, z) + x^c y^d) \tag{262}$$

where γ is a unit series.

If $\tau = 0$, then there exist permissible parameters x, y, z at p such that either p is a 1-point and

$$u = x^a, v = y, w_i = x^b(\beta + z) \tag{263}$$

with $\beta \in \mathbf{k}$, $b > 0$, or p is a 2-point and

$$u = (x^a y^b)^k, v = z, w_i = x^c y^d \tag{264}$$

with $ad - bc \neq 0$.

Suppose that there exists n_0 such that q_n is a 2-point for all $n \geq n_0$. Suppose that $n \geq n_0$. Then by comparing (244), (243) and (245) or (246), we see that (245) cannot occur (since we assume some component of $D_{Y(n)}$ containing q_n does not contract to q). We have an expression:

$$\begin{aligned} u &= u_{\overline{R}_i(n)} v^{e_n}_{\overline{R}_i(n)}, \\ v &= v_{\overline{R}_i(n)}, \\ w_i &= u^{f_n}_{\overline{R}_i(n)} v^{g_n}_{\overline{R}_i(n)} w_{\overline{R}_i(n)}, \end{aligned}$$

and $e_n, f_n, g_n \geq n - n_0$.

We have $\nu(u) > n\nu(v) > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Thus ν is a composite valuation, and there exists a prime ideal P of the valuation ring V of ν such that $u \in P$, $v \notin P$. Let ν_1 be a valuation whose valuation ring is V_P. We have $\nu_1(v) = 0$, $\nu_1(u) > 0$. We further have

$$\nu_1(w_i) > n\nu_1(u) > 0 \tag{265}$$

for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$.

Suppose that $\tau > 0$ (and q_n is a 2-point for $n \geq n_0$). At $p = p_0 \in X$, we have a form (261) or (262). In (261) we have

$$\nu_1(w_i) = \frac{b}{a}\nu_1(u)$$

and in (262) we have

$$\nu_1(w_i) = \frac{t}{k}\nu_1(u),$$

a contradiction (to (265).

Suppose that $\tau = 0$. If $\beta \neq 0$ in (263), then the analysis is the same as for the $\tau > 0$ case, so we may assume that $\beta = 0$ if (263) holds.

If (263) holds with $\beta = 0$, or if (264) holds, we finish the analysis in a similar way to the proof when q is a 2-point, and $\tau = 0$, given above.

The final case is when q_n is a 1-point for all n. From (244) (and Remark 9.6) we see that

$$u = u_{\overline{R}_i(\overline{q})} = u_{\overline{R}_i(n)(q_n)}, v = v_{\overline{R}_i(\overline{q})} = v_{\overline{R}_i(n)(q_n)}, w_i = w_{\overline{R}_i(\overline{q})} = u^n_{\overline{R}_i(n)(q_n)} w_{\overline{R}_i(n)(q_n)},$$

so that

$$\nu(w_i) > n\nu(u) > 0 \tag{266}$$

for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$.

Suppose that $\tau > 0$ (and q_n is a 1-point for all n). At $p = p_0 \in X$ we have a form (261) or (262), which implies

$$\nu(w_i) = \frac{b}{a}\nu(u)$$

or

$$\nu(w_i) = \frac{t}{k}\nu(u),$$

a contradiction to (266).

When $\tau = 0$, the proof follows in a similar way to the proof when q is a 2-point and $\tau = 0$.

We have shown that for all 0-dimensional valuations ν of $\mathbf{k}(X)$, there exists n such that ν is resolved on $X(n)$.

By compactness of the Zariski-Riemann manifold [Z] there exists N such that all $\nu \in \Omega(X)$ are resolved on $X(N)$, a contradiction to our assumption that (252) is of infinite length. The diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} X(N) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y(N) \arrow[d] \\ X \arrow[r] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

thus satisfies the conclusions of Theorem 9.7.

□

Theorem 9.8. *Suppose that $\tau \geq 0$, $f : X \to Y$ is τ-quasi-well prepared with relation R. Then there exists a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

such that Φ and Ψ are products of blow ups of possible centers and f_1 is τ-quasi-well prepared with relation R^1 and pre-algebraic structure. Further, R has an algebraic structure. (R^1 will in general not be the transform of R.)

Proof. By Theorem 9.7 there exists a τ-quasi-well prepared diagram (201) as in the hypothesis of Lemma 9.5. Then Lemma 9.5 implies that the conclusions of Theorem 9.8 hold. □

Lemma 9.9. *Suppose that $\tau \geq 0$, $f : X \to Y$ is τ-quasi-well prepared with relation R and pre-algebraic structure (or τ-well prepared with relation R), $q \in U(R)$ is a 2-point and $p \in f^{-1}(q) \cap T(R_i)$ for some i. Suppose that E is a component of D_Y containing q. Let $C = \overline{E \cdot S_{\overline{R}_i}(q)}$.*

Let $\Psi_n : Y_n \to Y$ be obtained by blowing up q, then blowing up the point q_1 which is the intersection of the exceptional divisor over q and the strict transform of C on Y_1, and iterating this procedure n times, blowing up the intersection point of the last exceptional divisor with the strict transform of C. Let

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_n \arrow[r, "f_n"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_n"'] & Y_n \arrow[d, "\Psi_n"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

be a τ-quasi-well prepared (or τ-well prepared) diagram of R and Ψ_n obtained from Lemma 8.6 (so that Φ_n is an isomorphism above $f^{-1}(Y - \Sigma(Y))$).

Suppose that for all $n > 0$ there exists a point $p_n \in \Phi_n^{-1}(p) \cap T(R_i^n)$ such that $f_n(p_n) = q_n \in \Psi_n^{-1}(q) \cap C_n$, where C_n is the strict transform of C on Y_n. Then C is a component of the fundamental locus of f.

Proof. The proof follows from Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 9.7. Let

$$u = u_{\overline{R}_i(q)}, v = v_{\overline{R}_i(q)}, w_i = w_{\overline{R}_i(q)}.$$

After possibly interchanging u and v, $v = w_i = 0$ are local equations of C at q.

By our construction of Ψ_n, we have that

$$u_1 = u_{\overline{R}_i^n(q_n)}, v_1 = v_{\overline{R}_i^n(q_n)}, w_{i,1} = w_{\overline{R}_i^n(q_n)}$$

are defined by

$$u = u_1, v = u_1^n v_1, w_i = u_1^n w_{i,1}.$$

We must have an expression (216), (221), (224) or (225). It follows, as in the analysis of step 1 of Theorem 9.7 that C is in the fundamental locus of f.

$\square$

Theorem 9.10. *Suppose that $\tau \geq 0$ and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is τ-quasi-well prepared with relation R and pre-algebraic structure. Further suppose that R has an algebraic structure. Then there exists a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that Φ,Ψ are products of blow ups of possible centers and f_1 is τ-well prepared with relation R^1. (In general, R^1 is not the transform of R).

Proof. 1 and 2 of Definition 7.3 of a τ-well prepared relation R hold by assumption.

For $i \neq j$, Let H_{ij} be the set of points $q \in U(R_i) \cap U(R_j)$ such that neither an expression (130) nor (131) of 3 of Definition 7.3 holds between $w_{\overline{R}_i(q)}$ and $w_{\overline{R}_j(q)}$. We see by 3 of Definition 7.1 (and (118) - (120)) that H_{ij} is a finite set.

Let $\tilde{\Psi}_1 : \tilde{Y}_1 \rightarrow Y$ be the blow up of the union of the sets

$$\{q \in H_{ij} \mid f^{-1}(H_{ij}) \cap [T(R_i) \cup T(R_j)] \neq \emptyset\}.$$

By Lemmas 8.6 and 8.8, there exists a τ-quasi-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\tilde{X}_1 \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}_1"] \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Phi}_1"'] & \tilde{Y}_1 \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Psi}_1"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y.
\end{tikzcd}$$

We define finite sets H^1_{ij} in the same way for the transform $\tilde{R}^1$ of R, and iterate to construct a τ-quasi-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\tilde{X}_n \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}_n"] \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Phi}_n"'] & \tilde{Y}_n \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Psi}_n"] \\
\tilde{X}_{n-1} \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}_{n-1}"] & \tilde{Y}_{n-1} \\
\vdots \arrow[d] & \vdots \arrow[d] \\
\tilde{X}_1 \arrow[r, "\tilde{f}_1"] \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Phi}_1"'] & \tilde{Y}_1 \arrow[d, "\tilde{\Psi}_1"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y,
\end{tikzcd} \tag{267}$$

continuing as long as $\tilde{f}_n^{-1}(H^n_{ij}) \cap [T(R^n_i) \cup T(R^n_j)] \neq \emptyset$ for some $i \neq j$.

Suppose that (267) doesn't terminate after a finite number of blow ups n. Then there exist $i \neq j$ and a valuation ν of the function field $\mathbf{k}(X)$ of X such that the center

p_n of ν on $\tilde{X}_n$ and the center q_n of ν on $\tilde{Y}_n$ satisfy $q_n \in H^n_{ij}$, $p_n \in \tilde{f}_n^{-1}(H^n_{ij}) \cap T(\tilde{R}^n_i)$ for all n.

For all n, we may identify ν with an extension of ν to the quotient field of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\tilde{X}_n,p_n}$ which dominates $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\tilde{X}_n,p_n}$.

Let

$$u_n = u_{\overline{R}^n_i(q_n)}, v_n = v_{\overline{R}^n_i(q_n)}, w_{ni} = w_{\overline{R}^n_i(q_n)}, w_{nj} = w_{\overline{R}^n_j(q_n)}.$$

We have

$$u_n = u_{n+1}, v_n = u_{n+1}(v_{n+1} + \alpha_{n+1}), w_{ni} = u_{n+1}w_{n+1,i}, w_{nj} = u_{n+1}w_{n+1,j} \tag{268}$$

with $\alpha_{n+1} \in \mathbf{k}$, or

$$u_n = u_{n+1}v_{n+1}, v_n = v_{n+1}, w_{ni} = v_{n+1}w_{n+1,i}, w_{nj} = v_{n+1}w_{n+1,j} \tag{269}$$

for all n.

The relation

$$w_{nj} = w_{ni} + \lambda^n_{ij}(u_n, v_n)$$

of 3 of Definition 7.1 transforms as

$$\lambda^{n+1}_{ij}(u_{n+1}, v_{n+1}) = \frac{\lambda^n_{ij}(u_{n+1}, u_{n+1}(v_{n+1} + \alpha_{n+1}))}{u_{n+1}}$$

if (268) holds, and transforms as

$$\lambda^{n+1}_{ij}(u_{n+1}, v_{n+1}) = \frac{\lambda^n_{ij}(u_{n+1}v_{n+1}, v_{n+1})}{v_{n+1}}$$

if (269) holds.

Let $\mathcal{F}_n$ be the germ at q_n of the divisor $\lambda^n_{ij} = 0$. By embedded resolution of plane curve singularities, there exists n_0 such that $D_{\tilde{X}_n} + \mathcal{F}_n$ is a SNC divisor at q_n for all $n \geq n_0$. If q_n is a 2-point for some $n \geq n_0$, we have that $q_n \notin H^n_{ij}$, a contradiction, so we have that q_n is a 1-point for all $n \geq n_0$. Thus a form (268) holds for all $n \geq n_0$. We have

$$w_{n_0 i} = u_{n_0}^{n-n_0} w_{ni}.$$

Thus

$$\nu(w_{n_0 i}) > n\nu(u_{n_0}) > 0 \tag{270}$$

for all positive n.

Suppose that $\tau > 0$. Since $q_{n_0} \in U(\tilde{R}^{n_0}_i)$ is a 1-point, we have permissible parameters x, y, z at p_{n_0} such that

$$u_{n_0} = x^a, v_{n_0} = y, w_{n_0 i} = x^c\gamma \tag{271}$$

where $\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\tilde{X}_{n_0},p_{n_0}}$ is a unit series, or

$$u_{n_0} = (x^a y^b)^k, v_{n_0} = z, w_{n_0,i} = (x^a y^b)^l\gamma \tag{272}$$

where $\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\tilde{X}_{n_0},p_{n_0}}$ is a unit series. In either case, we have a contradiction to (270).

If $\tau = 0$, then we have one of the following forms at p_{n_0}.

$$u_{n_0} = x^a, v_{n_0} = y, w_{n_0 i} = x^c(z + \beta)$$

with $\beta \in \mathbf{k}$, or

$$u_{n_0} = (x^a y^b)^k, v_{n_0} = z, w_{n_0,i} = x^c y^d$$

with $a, b > 0$ and $ad - bc \neq 0$.

We obtain a contradiction to (270), as in the $\tau=0$ case, unless we have the form

$$u_{n_0}=x^a, v_{n_0}=y, w_{n_0 i}=x^c z.$$

Now by an argument similar to the case $\tau=0$ of Theorem 9.7, we obtain

$$\tau_{\tilde f_n}(p_n)=-\infty$$

for $n>>0$, a contradiction.

Thus (267) terminates in a finite number of steps n. Let $(R^n)'$ be the restriction of $\tilde R^n$, defined by

$$U((R^n)'_i)=\tilde f_n(T(\tilde R^n_i)).$$

Let

$$\Omega((R^n)'_i)=\Omega(\tilde R^n_i)-[U(\tilde R^n_i)-U((R^n)')].$$

We have that $\tilde f_n:\tilde X_n\rightarrow\tilde Y_n$ with relation $(R^n)'$ satisfies 1, 2 and 3 of Definition 7.3 of a τ-well prepared morphism.

There exists a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves $\Psi_1:Y_1\rightarrow\tilde Y_n$ such that 4 (as well as 3) of Definition 7.3 hold for the transforms $\{\overline{R}^1_i\}$ of the $\{(\overline{R}^n)'_i\}$ on Y_1 at all 2-points of $U((\overline{R}^n)'_i)$, by Lemma 5.14 [C6]). By Lemma 8.1, there exists a τ-quasi-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\
\tilde X_n \arrow[r, "\tilde f_n"] & \tilde Y_n
\end{tikzcd}$$

of $(R^n)'_i$ and Ψ_1 where Φ_1 is a product of blow ups of 2-curves. Let R^1 be the transform of $(R^n)'$ on X_1. f_1 is τ-well prepared with relation R^1. ☐

Theorem 9.11. *Suppose that $\tau\ge 0$ and $f:X\rightarrow Y$ is τ-well prepared with relation R. Then there exists a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that Φ,Ψ are products of blow ups of possible centers and f_1 is τ-very-well prepared with relation R^1. (In general, R^1 is not the transform of R).

Proof. Let $\Omega=G_Y(f,\tau)-\Theta(f,Y)$. Ω is a finite set by Remark 5.16.

Let R' be the restriction of R to Ω. R' has algebraic structure determined by the algebraic structure of R.

By Theorem 9.3, there exists a τ-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_2 \arrow[r, "f_2"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_2"'] & Y_2 \arrow[d, "\Psi_2"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

for R where Φ_2 and Ψ_2 are products of blow ups of possible centers such that f_2 is τ-well prepared for the transform R^2 of R', and there exists an open subset $V\subset Y$ such that $Y-V$ is a finite set of points and f_2 is toroidal over $\Psi_2^{-1}(V)$. Further, $V\cap G_Y(f,\tau)=\Theta(f,Y)$. Since Ω is finite, we may modify the R', so that $U(R'_i)$ is a single point $\{q_i\}$ for all primitive relations R'_i associated to R'.

Let R^2_i be a primitive relation associated to R^2. Then $U(R'_i)=\{q_i\}$ for some $q_i\in\Omega$. $\Omega(R'_i)$ is a neighborhood of q_i on a surface in Y, and $\Omega(R^2_i)\rightarrow\Omega(R'_i)$ is a projective birational map. Suppose that E is a component of D_{Y_2} such that $\gamma=E\cdot\Omega(R^2_i)$ dominates a curve (containing q_i) of $\Omega(R'_i)$. Then a general point η

of γ is a 1-point over which f_2 is toroidal, since $\Psi_2(\eta) \in V$. Hence f_2 is finite over a general point of γ, and γ is not in the fundamental locus of f_2. Further, by Remark 9.6, if $q \in \gamma \cap U(R_i^2)$, and $f_2^{-1}(q) \cap T(R_i^2) \neq \emptyset$, then q is a 2-point.

By Lemma 9.9, there exists a τ-well prepared diagram (for R^2)

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_3 \arrow[r, "f_3"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_3"'] & Y_3 \arrow[d, "\Psi_3"] \\ X_2 \arrow[r, "f_2"] & Y_2 \end{tikzcd}$$

where Ψ_3 is a product of blow ups of prepared 2-points (of type 1 in Definition 7.5) such that if R_i^3 is a primitive relation associated to the transform R^3 of R^2, E is a component of D_{Y_3}, and $\gamma = E \cdot \Omega(R_i^3)$ is not exceptional for $\Omega(R_i^3) \rightarrow \Omega(R_i')$, then $\gamma \cap f_3(T(R_i^3)) = \emptyset$. We further have that $f_3(T(R^3)) \cap \gamma = \emptyset$. We see this as follows. Suppose that $p \in f_3(T(R^3)) \cap \gamma$. $\Psi_3(E)$ is a component of D_{Y_2}. Thus p is on the strict transform γ' of $\overline{\Psi_3(E) \cdot \Omega(R_j^2)}$ on Y_3, which is not exceptional for Ψ_2. Since $\gamma' = \overline{E \cdot \Omega(R_j^3)}$, we have a contradiction.

Let

$$W_3 = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \gamma = \overline{S_{R_i^3}(q) \cdot E} \text{ such that } E \text{ is a component of } D_{Y_3}, \\ R_i^3 \text{ is associated to } R^3 \text{ and } q \in f_3(T(R^3)) \cap U(\overline{R}_i^3) \end{array} \right\}.$$

We have that all $\gamma \in W_3$ contract to a point on Y_1. Let

$$Z_3 = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} q \in U(R^3) - f_3(T(R^3)) \text{ such that there exist } \gamma_i, \gamma_j \in W_3 \\ \text{such that } \gamma_i \neq \gamma_j \text{ and } q \in \gamma_i \cap \gamma_j. \end{array} \right\}$$

Suppose that $q \in Z_3$. Then there exist $\gamma_i = \overline{S_{R_i^3}(p_i) \cdot E_1} \in W_3$ and $\gamma_j = \overline{S_{R_j^3}(p_j) \cdot E_2} \in W_3$ such that $q \in \gamma_i \cap \gamma_j$ and $\gamma_i \neq \gamma_j$.

γ_i and γ_j are exceptional, so they contract to the common point $q_i = q_j \in U(R')$. thus γ_i and γ_j are contained in $\Omega(R_i^3)$ and $\Omega(R_j^3)$ respectively.

The points of Z_3 are prepared 2-points for R^3 (of type 1 of Definition 7.5). Let $\Psi_4 : Y_4 \rightarrow Y_3$ be the blow up of Z_3. By Lemma 8.6, there exists a τ-well prepared diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_4 \arrow[r, "f_4"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_4"'] & Y_4 \arrow[d, "\Psi_4"] \\ X_3 \arrow[r, "f_3"] & Y_3 \end{tikzcd}$$

of R^3 and Ψ_4. Let R^4 be the transform of R^3 on X_4.

Define

$$W_4 = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \gamma = \overline{S_{\overline{R}_i^4}(q) \cdot E} \text{ such that } E \text{ is a component of } D_{Y_4}, \\ R_i^4 \text{ is associated to } R^4 \text{ and } q \in \Psi_4^{-1}(f_3(T(R^3))) \cap U(\overline{R}_i^4) \end{array} \right\},$$

$$Z_4 = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} q \in U(R^4) - \Psi_4^{-1}(f_3(T(R^3))) \text{ such that there exist } \gamma_i, \gamma_j \in W_4 \\ \text{such that } \gamma_i \neq \gamma_j \text{ and } q \in \gamma_i \cap \gamma_j. \end{array} \right\}$$

We necessarily have that the curves in W_4 are strict transforms of curves in W_3. We can iterate, blowing up Z_4, and constructing a τ-well prepared diagram, and repeating until we eventually construct a τ-well prepared diagram of R^4

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_5 \arrow[r, "f_5"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_5"'] & Y_5 \arrow[d, "\Psi_5"] \\ X_4 \arrow[r, "f_4"] & Y_4 \end{tikzcd}$$

such that Ψ_5 is a sequence of blow ups of prepared 2-points (of type 1 of Definition 7.5) and if $\gamma_1 = \overline{S_{\overline{R}_i^5}(q_i)\cdot E_i}$, $\gamma_2 = \overline{S_{\overline{R}_j^5}(q_j)\cdot E_j}$, for $q_i \in U(\overline{R}_i^5)\cap(\Psi_4\circ\Psi_5)^{-1}(f_3(T(R^3)))$ (where R^5 is the transform of R^4) and E_1, E_2 components of D_{Y_5}, are such that $\gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2$, then $\gamma_1\cap\gamma_2 \subset U(R^5)\cap(\Psi_4\circ\Psi_5)^{-1}(f_3(T(R^3)))$.

We now construct pre-relations $\overline{R}_i^*$ on Y_5 with associated primitive relations R_i^* for f_5.

Let $T(R_i^*) = T(R_i^5)$ and let

$$U(R_i^*) = U(R_i^5)\cap(\Psi_4\circ\Psi_5)^{-1}(f_3(T(R^3))). \tag{273}$$

For $q' \in U(\overline{R}_i^*)$, define $\overline{R}_i^*(q') = \overline{R}_i^5(q')$. For $p \in T(R_i^*)$ define $R_i^*(p) = \overline{R}_i^5(f_5(p))$. Let R^* be the relation for f_5 defined by the R_i^*. Let $\Omega(\overline{R}_i^*) = \Omega(\overline{R}_i^5)$.

For all $\overline{R}_i^*$, let

$$V_i(Y_5) = \left\{\gamma = \overline{E_\alpha\cdot S_{\overline{R}_i^*}(q)} \text{ such that } q\in U(\overline{R}_i^*),\ E_\alpha \text{ is a component of } D_{Y_5}\right\}.$$

Recall that these curves are all exceptional for $\Psi_2\circ\Psi_3\circ\Psi_4\circ\Psi_5$.

By our construction, Lemmas 8.4, 8.1, 8.6, 8.7 and 8.8, and Remark 8.2 and 2 of Remark 8.11, every curve $\gamma\in V_i(Y_5)$ is prepared for R^5 of type 6. By (273), we now conclude that every curve $\gamma\in V_i(Y_5)$ is prepared for R^* of type 6. 1 and 2 of Definition 7.7 thus hold for f_5 and R^*. 3 of Definition 7.7 holds for f_5 and R^* since for all $\overline{R}_i^*$, $V_i(Y_5)$ consists of exceptional curves of $\Omega(\overline{R}_i^*)$ contracting to a nonsingular point $q_i\in\Omega(\overline{R}_i')$. Thus f_5 is τ-very-well prepared with relation R^*.

□

Theorem 9.12. *Suppose that $f: X\rightarrow Y$ is prepared and $\tau=\tau_f(X)\geq 0$. Then there exists a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that f_1 is prepared, Φ, Ψ are products of blowups of 2-curves, $\tau_{f_1}(X_1)\leq\tau$, and $G_{Y_1}(f_1,\tau)$ contains no 3-points and no 2-curves, so that f_1 is τ-prepared.

Proof. This is immediate from Lemma 4.1 [C7] and Lemma 5.4. □

Theorem 9.13. *Suppose that $f: X\rightarrow Y$ is prepared, and $\tau=\tau_f(X)\geq 0$. Then there exists a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f_1"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that Φ_1 and Ψ_1 are products of blow ups of possible centers and f_1 is τ-very-well prepared with a relation R^1.

Proof. By Theorem 9.12, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that Φ and Ψ are products of 2-curves, and f_1 is τ-prepared. Now by Theorems 9.4, 9.8, 9.10 and 9.11, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_2 \arrow[r, "f_2"] \arrow[d] & Y_2 \arrow[d] \\
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] & Y_1
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the vertical arrows are products of blow ups of possible centers such that f_2 is τ-very-well prepared.

□

10. Toroidalization

Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a proper, birational morphism of nonsingular 3-folds with toroidal structures D_Y and $D_X = f^{-1}(D_Y)$, such that D_X contains the singular locus of f.

Theorem 10.1. *Suppose that $\tau \geq 0$ and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is τ-very-well prepared with relation R. Then there exists a τ-very-well prepared diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d] & Y_1 \arrow[d] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that the transform R^1 of R is resolved ($T(R') = \emptyset$). In particular, f_1 is prepared and $\tau_{f_1}(X_1) < \tau$.

Proof. Fix a pre-relation $\overline{R}_t$ associated to R on Y, with associated primitive relation R_t. By induction on the number of pre-relations associated to R, it suffices to resolve R_t by a τ-very-well prepared diagram (of R).

Recall (Definition 7.7)

$$V_t(Y) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \overline{E \cdot S} \text{ such that } E \text{ is a component of } D_Y, \\ S = S_{\overline{R}_t}(q) \text{ for some } q \in U(\overline{R}_t) \end{array} \right\}.$$

$F_t = \sum_{\gamma \in V_t(Y)} \gamma$ is a SNC divisor on $\Omega(\overline{R}_t)$ whose intersection graph is a forest.

If $\gamma_1 = \overline{E_1 \cdot S_{\overline{R}_t}(q_1)} \in V_t(Y)$ and $q \in \gamma_1$, we will say that γ_1 is good at q if whenever $q \in U(\overline{R}_i)$ for some i, then $S_{\overline{R}_i}(q)$ contains the germ of γ_1 at q (so that $\gamma_1 = \overline{E_1 \cdot S_{\overline{R}_i}(q)} \subset \Omega(\overline{R}_i)$). Otherwise, say that γ_1 is bad at q. Say that γ_1 is good if γ_1 is good at q for all $q \in \gamma_1$.

Let $Y_0 = Y$, $X_0 = X$, $f_0 = f$. We will show that there exists a sequence of τ-very-well prepared diagrams of the transform of R,

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_{i+1} \arrow[r, "f_{i+1}"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_{i+1}"'] & Y_{i+1} \arrow[d, "\Psi_{i+1}"'] \\
X_i \arrow[r, "f_i"] & Y_i
\end{tikzcd} \tag{274}$$

for $0 \leq i \leq m-1$ such that the transform R_t^m of R_t on X_m is resolved.

Suppose that $\gamma_1 \in V_t(Y)$ and $q \in \gamma_1$ is a bad point. By Remark 7.8, we have that $q \in U(\overline{R}_t)$. By (131) of Definition 7.3, we have that q is a 2-point. Suppose that E_1, E_2 are the two components of D_Y containing q, and $\gamma_1 = \overline{E_1 \cdot S_{\overline{R}_t}(q)}$. Let $\gamma_2 = \overline{E_2 \cdot S_{\overline{R}_t}(q)}$.

We will show that q is a good point of γ_2.

γ_1 not good at q implies there exists $j \neq t$ such that $q \in U(\overline{R}_j)$ and the germ of γ_1 at q is not contained in $S_{\overline{R}_j}(q)$. Let

$$u = u_{\overline{R}_t}(q), v = v_{\overline{R}_t}(q), w_t = w_{\overline{R}_t}(q).$$

After possibly interchanging u and v we have that $u = w_t = 0$ are local equations of γ_1, $v = w_t = 0$ are local equations of γ_2 at q. Let $w_j = w_{\overline{R}_j}(q)$. In the equation

$$w_j = w_t + u^{a_{tj}} v^{b_{tj}} \phi_{tj}$$

of (130) of Definition 7.3 we thus have $a_{tj} = 0$.

If q is not a good point for γ_2 then there exists $k \neq t$ such that $q \in U(\overline{R}_k)$ and the germ of γ_2 at q is not contained in $S_{\overline{R}_k}(q)$. Let $w_k = w_{\overline{R}_k}(q)$. In the equation

$$w_k = w_t + u^{a_{tk}} v^{b_{tk}} \phi_{tk}$$

of (130) we thus have $b_{tk} = 0$. But we must have

$$(0, b_{tj}) \leq (a_{tk}, 0) \text{ or } (a_{tk}, 0) \leq (0, b_{tk})$$

by 4 of Definition 7.3, which is impossible. Thus q is a good point for γ_2.

Suppose that all $\gamma \in V_t(Y)$ are bad. Pick $\gamma_1 \in V_t(Y)$. Since γ_1 is bad there exists $\gamma_2 \in V_t(Y) - \{\gamma_1\}$ such that γ_2 is good at $q_1 = \gamma_1 \cap \gamma_2$ (as shown above). $\gamma_1 \cap \gamma_2$ is a single point since $V_t(Y)$ is a forest. Since γ_2 is bad and $V_t(Y)$ is a forest, there exists $\gamma_3 \in V_t(Y)$ which intersects γ_2 at a single point q_2 and is disjoint from γ_1 such that γ_3 is good at q_2. Since $V_t(Y)$ is a finite set, and the intersection graph of $V_t(Y)$ is a forest, we must eventually find a curve which is good, a contradiction.

Let $\gamma \in V_t(Y)$ be a good curve, so that it is prepared for R of type 6, and is a *-permissible center (Lemma 8.10) and let $\Psi_1' : Y_1' \rightarrow Y$ be the blow up of γ.

By Lemma 8.10 we can construct a τ-very-well prepared diagram of the form of (134) of Definition 7.10

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[dd] & Y_1 \arrow[d] \\
 & Y_1' \arrow[d, "\Psi_1'"] \\
X \arrow[r] & Y.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{275}$$

where $Y_1 \rightarrow Y_1'$ is a sequence of blow ups of 2-points which are prepared for the transform of R of type 2 of Definition 7.5. Observe that if $\gamma_1 \in V_t(Y)$ is a good curve, with $\gamma_1 \neq \gamma$, then the strict transform of γ_1 is a good curve in $V_t(Y_1)$.

We now iterate this process. We order the curves in $V_t(Y)$, and choose $\gamma = \overline{E \cdot S_{R_t}(q)} \in V_t(Y)$ in the construction of the diagram (275) so that it is the minimum good curve in $V_t(Y)$.

We inductively define a sequence of τ-very well prepared diagrams (274) by blowing up the good curve in $V_t(Y_i)$ with smallest order, and then constructing a very well prepared diagram (274) of the form of (275). Then we define the total ordering on $V_t(Y_{i+1})$ so that the ordering of strict transforms of elements of $V_t(Y_i)$ is preserved, and these strict transforms have smaller order than the element of $V_t(Y_{i+1})$ which is not a strict transform of an element of $V_t(Y_i)$. We repeat, as long as R_t^i is not resolved ($T(R_t^i) \neq \emptyset$).

Suppose that the algorithm does not converge in the construction of $f_m : X_m \to Y_m$ such that the transform R_t^m of R_t is resolved. Then there exists a diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\vdots \arrow[d] & \vdots \arrow[d] \\
X_n \arrow[r, "f_n"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_n"'] & Y_n \arrow[d, "\Psi_n"] \\
X_{n-1} \arrow[r, "f_{n-1}"] \arrow[d] & Y_{n-1} \arrow[d] \\
\vdots \arrow[d] & \vdots \arrow[d] \\
X_0 = X \arrow[r, "f_0=f"] & Y_0 = Y
\end{tikzcd} \tag{276}$$

constructed by infinitely many iterations of the algorithm such that $T(R_t^n) \neq \emptyset$ for all n.

Suppose that $q_n \in U(\overline{R}_t^n)$ is an infinite sequence of points such that $\Psi_n(q_n) = q_{n-1}$ for all n and Ψ_n is not an isomorphism for infinitely many n. q_n is either a 2-point or a 1-point for all n.

First suppose that q_n is a 2-point for all n.

By construction, the restriction of Ψ_n to $S_{\overline{R}_t^n}(q_n)$ is an isomorphism onto $S_{\overline{R}_t^{n-1}}(q_{n-1})$ for all n. Thus the restriction

$$\overline{\Psi}_n = \Psi_1 \circ \cdots \circ \Psi_n : S_{\overline{R}_t^n}(q_n) \to S_{\overline{R}_t}(q)$$

is an isomorphism, where $q = q_0 = \Psi_1 \circ \cdots \circ \Psi_n(q_n)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that no Ψ_n is an isomorphism (on Y_n) at q_n. We have permissible parameters $u_i = u_{\overline{R}_t^i}(q_i), v_i = v_{\overline{R}_t^i}(q_i), w_{t,i} = w_{\overline{R}_t^i}(q_i)$ at q_i for all i such that either

$$u_i = u_{i+1}, v_i = v_{i+1}, w_{t,i} = u_{i+1}w_{t,i+1} \tag{277}$$

or

$$u_i = u_{i+1}, v_i = v_{i+1}, w_{t,i} = v_{i+1}w_{t,i+1}. \tag{278}$$

Suppose there exists $k \neq t$ such that $q_n \in U(\overline{R}_k^n)$ for all n.

Let $w_{k,i} = w_{\overline{R}_k^i}(q_i)$ for $i \geq 0$.

The relations

$$w_{k,i} - w_{t,i} = u_i^{a_{tk}} v_i^{b_{tk}} \phi_{t,k}$$

of (130) of Definition 7.3 transform to

$$w_{k,i+1} - w_{t,i+1} = u_{i+1}^{a_{tk}-1} v_{i+1}^{b_{tk}} \phi_{t,k}$$

under (277), and transform to

$$w_{k,i+1} - w_{t,i+1} = u_{i+1}^{a_{tk}} v_{i+1}^{b_{tk}-1} \phi_{t,k}$$

under (278). But we see that after a finite number of iterations $q_n \notin U(\overline{R}_k^n)$, unless $a_{tk} = b_{tk} = -\infty$. Thus there exists n_0, such that whenever $n \geq n_0$, $q_n \notin U(\overline{R}_k^n)$ if $k \neq t$ and $a_{kt}, b_{kt} \neq -\infty$.

Now suppose that q_n is a 1-point for all n. We have permissible parameters

$$u_i = u_{\overline{R}_t^i}(q_i), v_i = v_{\overline{R}_t^i}(q_i), w_{t,i} = w_{\overline{R}_t^i}(q_i)$$

at q_i for all i such that

$$u_i = u_{i+1}, v_i = v_{i+1}, w_{t,i} = u_{i+1}w_{t,i+1}$$

for all i.

Suppose that there exists $k \neq t$ such that $q_n \in U(\overline{R}_k^n)$ for all n. Let

$$w_{k,i} = w_{\overline{R}_k^i}(q_i)$$

for $i \geq 0$. The relation

$$w_{k,i} - w_{t,i} = u_i^{c_{t,k}} \phi_{t,k}$$

of (131) of Definition 7.3 transforms to

$$w_{k,i+1} - w_{t,i+1} = u_{i+1}^{c_{t,k}-1} \phi_{t,k}.$$

Thus after a finite number of iterations, $q_n \notin U(\overline{R}_k^n)$ unless $c_{t,k} = -\infty$. Thus there exists n_0 such that when $n \geq n_0$, $q_n \notin U(\overline{R}_k^n)$ if $k \neq t$ and $c_{t,k} \neq -\infty$.

By our ordering, we have that there exists an n_0 such that if $n \geq n_0$, $\gamma \in V_t(Y_n)$ is good and if k is such that $\gamma \cap U(\overline{R}_k^n) \neq \emptyset$ then $a_{kt}, b_{kt} = -\infty$ (or $c_{rk} = -\infty$), so that the Zariski closures of $\Omega(\overline{R}_k^n)$ and $\Omega(\overline{R}_t^n)$ are the same. Thus all elements of $V_t(Y_n)$ are good for $n \geq n_0$, since otherwise, there would be a bad curve $\gamma_1 \in V(Y_n)$ which intersects a good curve γ_2 at a point q' at which γ_1 is not good. But then we must have that there exists $k \neq t$ such that the Zariski closure of $\Omega(\overline{R}_k^n)$ is not equal to the Zariski closure of $\Omega(\overline{R}_t^n)$, and $q' \in U(\overline{R}_k^n)$, so that $\gamma_2 \cap U(\overline{R}_k^n) \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction.

Our birational morphism of $\Omega(\overline{R}_t^n)$ to $\Omega(\overline{R}_t)$ is an isomorphism in a neighborhood of $U(\overline{R}_t^n)$. Thus we have a natural identification of $V_t(Y_n)$ and $V_t(Y)$, and we see that for $n \geq n_0$, the Ψ_n cyclically blow up the different curves of $V_t(Y)$.

Since R_t^n is (by assumption) not resolved for all n, there are points $p_n \in T(R_t^n) \subset X_n$ such that $\Phi_n(p_n) = p_{n-1}$, and $f_n(p_n) = q_n \in U(\overline{R}_t^n)$ for all n. Without loss of generality, we may assume that no Ψ_n is an isomorphism at q_n.

We have that all q_n are 1-points or all q_n are 2-points.

First suppose that all q_n are 2-points.

With the above notation at $q_n = f_n(p_n)$, we have that (277) and (278) must alternate in the diagram (276) for $n \geq n_0$, by our ordering of $V_t(Y_n)$. Let $p = p_0 \in X = X_0$, $q = q_0 = f(p)$.

We have

$$u = u_n, v = v_n, w_t = u_n^{a_n} v_n^{b_n} w_{t,n} \tag{279}$$

where

$$u = u_{\overline{R}_t}(q), v = v_{\overline{R}_t}(q), w_t = w_{\overline{R}_t}(q)$$

and a_n, b_n are positive integers which both go to infinity as n goes to infinity.

There exists (by Theorem 4 of Section 4, Chapter VI [ZS]) a valuation ν of $\mathbf{k}(X)$ which dominates the (non-Noetherian) local ring $\cup_{n\geq 0}\mathcal{O}_{X_n,p_n}$, and thus dominates the local rings $\mathcal{O}_{X_n,p_n}$ for all n. Without loss of generality, we may identify ν with an extension of ν to the quotient field of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_n,p_n}$ which dominates $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_n,p_n}$ for all n.

Let x, y, z be permissible parameters for u, v, w_t at p. Suppose that p is a 3-point. Write (in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$)

$$\begin{aligned} u &= x^a y^b z^c \\ v &= x^d y^e z^f \\ w_t &= x^g y^h z^i \gamma \end{aligned} \tag{280}$$

where $xyz = 0$ is a local equation of D_X at p and γ is a unit series.

We may permute x, y, z so that $0 < \nu(x) \leq \nu(y) \leq \nu(z)$. We have (from (279))

$$\nu(w_t) - n\nu(u) - n\nu(v) > 0$$

for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Thus

$$0 < (g-na-nd)\nu(\overline{x})+(h-ne-nb)\nu(\overline{y})+(i-nf-nc)\nu(\overline{z}) \leq ((g+h+i)-nf-nc)\nu(\overline{z})$$

for all n. Thus $f=c=0$, but this is impossible, since $uv=0$ is a local equation of D_X at p.

There is a similar but simpler algorithm if p is a 1-point or a 2-point and $\tau > 0$, since $w_t = 0$ is supported on D_X at p.

Suppose that $\tau = 0$ (and all q_n are 2-points). We have that $w_t=0$ is a divisor supported on D_X at p, so that the argument for $\tau > 0$ works in this case also, or we have one of the following two special forms:

p a 1-point

$$u = x^a, v = x^b(\alpha + y), w_t = x^c z \tag{281}$$

or p a 2-point

$$u = x^a y^b, v = x^c y^d, w_t = x^e y^f z \tag{282}$$

with $ad - bc \neq 0$.

In the diagram (275) we have that $q_1 \in U(R_i^1)$ implies $Y_1 \rightarrow Y_1'$ is an isomorphism near q_1. $X_1 \rightarrow X$ factors in a neighborhood of q_1 as a diagram

$$X_1 = W_m \overset{\Lambda_m}{\rightarrow} W_{m-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow W_1 \overset{\Lambda_1}{\rightarrow} X$$

where $\Lambda_1 : W_1 \rightarrow X$ is a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves and 3-points, and each Λ_{j+1} is the blow up of a possible curve Σ_j containing a 1-point and the center $\overline{p}_j$ of ν on W_j, such that $\mathcal{I}_\gamma \mathcal{O}_W$ is not invertible.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $u = w_t = 0$ are local equations of γ at q.

We have a form (281) or (282) at the center $\overline{p}_1$ of ν on W_1, where $(a,b) \leq (e,f)$ or $(a,b) > (e,f)$ if (282) holds.

Suppose that $a \leq c$ in (281), or $(a,b) \leq (e,f)$ in (282). Then $\mathcal{I}_\gamma \mathcal{O}_{W_1,\overline{p}_1}$ is invertible. Thus $W_m = W_1$, and in a neighborhood of q_1, $X_1 \rightarrow X$ is a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves. Further, we have an expression of the form (281) or (282) at p_1.

Suppose that $a > c$ in (281). Then Λ_2 is the blow up of a curve with local equations $x = z = 0$ at $\overline{p}_1$. Since $\nu(z) > n\nu(x)$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, at $\overline{p}_2$ we have regular parameters x_2, y_2, z_2 defined by

$$x = x_2, y = y_2, z = x_2 z_2$$

and we thus have

$$u = x_2^a, v = x_2^b(\alpha + y_2), w_t = x_2^{c+1} z_2.$$

Iterating, we see that $\overline{p}_m$ has permissible parameters x_m, y_m, z_m such that

$$u = x_m^a, v = x_m^b(\alpha + y_m), w_t = x_m^a z_m.$$

The permissible parameters $u_1, v_1, w_{t,1}$ at q_1 are defined by

$$u = u_1, v = v_1, w_t = u_1 w_{t1}.$$

Thus

$$u_1 = x_m^a, v_1 = x_m^b(\alpha + y_m), w_{t1} = z_m$$

and we have $\tau_{f_1}(p_1) = -\infty$, a contradiction.

We have a similar analysis if $(a,b) > (e,f)$ in (282), leading to the conclusions that $\tau_{f_1}(p_1) = -\infty$, a contradiction.

We thus see that for all n in (276), $X_n \rightarrow X_{n-1}$ factors as a sequence of blow ups of 2-curves at q_n.

Suppose that there exists n_0 such that p_{n_0} is a 1-point, and thus p_n is a 1-point for all $n \geq n_0$. Then we see that $X_{n+1} \rightarrow X_n$ is an isomorphism at p_n for all $n \geq n_0$. At p_{n_0} there are regular parameters x, y, z such that

$$u_{n_0} = x^a, v_{n_0} = x^b(\alpha + y), w_{tn_0} = x^c z, \tag{283}$$

and q_n has regular parameters

$$u_{n_0} = u_n, v_{n_0} = v_n, w_{tn_0} = u_n^{n-n_0} w_{tn}.$$

Substituting into (283), we have a contradiction as soon as

$$n > \frac{c}{a} + n_0.$$

Now suppose that p_n is a 2-point for all n. Then a form (282) holds at p_1, and at p_n, we have regular parameters x_n, y_n, z_n defined by

$$x = x_n^{r_{11}^n} y_n^{r_{12}^n}, y = x_n^{r_{21}^n} y_n^{r_{22}^n}, z = z_n \tag{284}$$

such that $r_{11}^n r_{22}^n - r_{12}^n r_{21}^n = \pm 1$.

Now from (279), (282) and (284), we see that

$$\nu(x^e y^f) - n\nu(x^a y^b) - n\nu(x^c y^d) > 0$$

for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, a contradiction, since $ad - bc \neq 0$.

The argument is simpler in the case when q_n is a 1-point for all n. (279) becomes

$$u = u_n, v = v_n, w_t = u_n^{a_n} w_{t,n} \tag{285}$$

where a_n goes to infinity as n goes to infinity.

Suppose that $\tau > 0$. If $p \in f^{-1}(q)$, $u = 0$ is a local equation of D_X at p, and $w_t = 0$ is supported on D_X at p. Thus (285) leads to a contradiction.

If $\tau = 0$, there is a similar argument to the above case of q_n a 2-point for all n and $\tau = 0$.

Thus the algorithm converges in a morphism $f_m : X_m \rightarrow Y_m$ such that $T(R_t^m) = \emptyset$, and after iterating for each primitive relation associated to R, we obtain the construction of $f_1 : X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$, as in the conclusions of the theorem, such that f_1 is prepared and $\tau_{f_1}(X_1) < \tau$.

□

Proof of Theorem 1.2 First suppose that X and Y are proper over $\mathbf{k}$. By resolution of singularities and resolution of indeterminacy [H] (cf. Section 6.8 [C6]), and by [M], there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_1"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi_1"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

where Φ_1, Ψ_1 are products of possible blow ups of points and nonsingular curves supported above D_X and D_Y, such that X_1 and Y_1 are nonsingular and projective. Further, $D_{Y_1} = \Psi_1^{-1}(D_Y)$ and $D_{X_1} = \Phi_1^{-1}(D_X) = f_1^{-1}(D_{Y_1})$ are SNC divisors, and D_{X_1} contains the locus where f_1 is not smooth. By Theorem 3.9, we can construct a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_2 \arrow[r, "f_2"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_2"'] & Y_2 \arrow[d, "\Psi_2"] \\
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] & Y_1
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that Φ_2 and Ψ_2 are products of possible blow ups of points and nonsingular curves, such that f_2 is prepared for $D_{Y_2} = \Psi_2^{-1}(D_{Y_1})$ and $D_{X_2} = \Phi_2^{-1}(D_{X_1})$.

Now by descending induction on $\tau = \tau_{f_2}(X_2)$ and Theorems 9.13 and 10.1, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_3 \arrow[r, "f_3"] \arrow[d, "\Phi_3"'] & Y_3 \arrow[d, "\Psi_3"] \\
X_2 \arrow[r, "f_2"] & Y_2
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that Φ_2 and Ψ_3 are products of blow ups of possible centers, f_3 is prepared, and $\tau_{f_3}(X_3) = -\infty$.

Thus f_3 is toroidal, and the conclusions of the theorem follow.

Now suppose that X and Y are (not necessarily proper) abstract varieties. There exist (by [N]) proper **k**-varieties $\overline{X}$ and $\overline{Y}$ such that X is an open subset of $\overline{X}$, and Y is an open subset of $\overline{Y}$. After possibly modifying $\overline{X}$ and $\overline{Y}$ by blowing up $\overline{X} - X$ and $\overline{Y} - Y$, we may assume that $F_1 = \overline{X} - X$ and $F_2 = \overline{Y} - Y$ are closed subsets of pure codimension 1 in $\overline{X}$, $\overline{Y}$ respectively.

Let $\overline{D}_X$ be the Zariski closure of D_X in $\overline{X}$, $\overline{D}_Y$ be the Zariski closure of D_Y in $\overline{Y}$.

Let $D_{\overline{X}} = \overline{D}_X + F_1$, $D_{\overline{Y}} = \overline{D}_Y + F_2$. By resolution of indeterminancy, after possibly modifying $\overline{X}$ by blowing up subvarieties of $\overline{X}$ supported above $D_{\overline{X}}$, we have that the rational map $\overline{f} : \overline{X} \rightarrow \overline{Y}$ which extends $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism.

The hypotheses of Theorem 1.2 are satisfied for $\overline{f} : \overline{X} \rightarrow \overline{Y}$, so by the first part of this proof, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{X}_1 \arrow[r, "\overline{f}_1"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Phi}"'] & \overline{Y}_1 \arrow[d, "\overline{\Psi}"] \\
\overline{X} \arrow[r, "\overline{f}"] & \overline{Y}
\end{tikzcd}$$

satisfying the conclusions of Theorem 1.2.

Let $X_1 = \Phi^{-1}(X)$, $Y_1 = \Psi^{-1}(Y)$, $f_1 = \overline{f}_1 \mid X_1$, $\Phi = \overline{\Phi} \mid D_1$, $\Psi = \overline{\Psi} \mid Y_1$. Then

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"'] & Y_1 \arrow[d, "\Psi"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

satisfying the conclusions of Theorem 1.2.

11. List of technical terms

(See also Section 2, Notation)

admissible center: Definition 6.2
fundamental locus: Remark 3.5
$G_X(f, \tau)$: Definition 4.4
$G_Y(f, \tau)$: Definition 4.4
good at p for f: Definition 5.6
monomial form: Definition 3.4
perfect for f: Definition 5.13.
permissible center: Definition 7.9
*-permissible center: Definition 7.10
permissible parameters: before and after Definition 3.1
possible center: Section 2, Notation
prepared point or curve of type 1-5: Definition 7.5
prepared curve of type 6: Definition 7.6
prepared morphism

  - prepared morphism of 3-folds: Definition 3.6
  - τ-prepared morphism: Definition 4.4
  - pre-τ-quasi-well prepared: Definition 7.1
  - τ-quasi-well prepared: Definition 7.1
  - τ-well prepared: Definition 7.3
  - τ-very-well prepared: Definition 7.7
- relation
  - quasi-pre-relation: Definition 6.1
  - pre-relation: Definition 6.3
  - algebraic pre-relation: Definition 6.4
  - primitive relation: Definition 6.5
  - relation: Definition 6.5
  - algebraic relation: Definition 6.5
- resolved quasi-pre-relation: after Definition 6.1
- resolved relation: after Definition 6.5
- resolving curve: Definition 7.4
- super parameters: Definition 5.1
- $\tau_f(p)$: Definition 4.1
- $\tau_f(X)$: after Definition 4.1
- τ-quasi-well prepared diagram: after Definitions 7.9 and 7.11
- $\Theta(f, Y)$: Definition 5.15
- toroidal forms for u, v, w: after Definition 3.3
- toroidal forms for u, v: Definition 3.1
- torodial morphism: Definition 3.3
- transform of a pre-relation: after Definition 6.2
- transform of a relation: after Definition 6.6
- weakly good at p for f: Definition 5.7

References

[Ab1] Abhyankar, S., *On the valuations centered in a local domain*, Amer. J. Math. 78 (1956), 321 – 348.

[Ab2] Abhyankar, S., *Algebraic Geometry for Scientists and Engineers*, Amer. Math. Soc., 1990.

[Ab3] Abhyankar, S., *Resolution of Singularities of Embedded Surfaces*, Academic Press, New York, 1966.

[AK] Abramovich D., Karu K., *Weak semistable reduction in characteristic 0*, Invent. Math. 139 (2000), 241 – 273.

[AkK] Akbulut, S. and King, H., *Topology of algebraic sets*, MSRI publications 25, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

[AKMW] Abramovich, D., Karu, K., Matsuki, K. and Wlodarczyk, J., *Torification and factorization of birational maps*, JAMS 15 (2002), 531 – 572.

[AMR] Abramovich, D., Matsuki, K., Rashid, S., *A note on the factorization theorem of toric birational maps after Morelli and its toroidal extension*, Tohoku Math J. 51 (1999), 489 – 537, *Correction:* Tohoku Math J. 52 (2000), 629 – 631.

[BrM] Bierstone, E. and Millman, P., *Canonical desingularization in characteristic zero by blowing up the maximal strata of a local invariant*, Inv. Math 128 (1997), 207 – 302.

[BEV] Bravo, A., Encinas, S., Villamayor, O.,*A simplified proof of desingularization and applications*, to appear in Revista Matematica Iberamericana.

[Ch] Christensen, C., *Strong domination/weak factorization of three dimensional regular local rings*, Journal of the Indian Math. Soc., 45 (1981), 21 – 47.

[C1] Cutkosky, S.D., *Local factorization of birational maps*, Advances in Mathematics 132 (1997), 167 – 315.

[C2] Cutkosky, S.D., *Local monomialization and factorization of morphisms*, Astérisque 260, 1999.

[C3] Cutkosky, S.D., *Monomialization of Morphisms from 3-folds to surfaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1786, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 2002.

[C4] Cutkosky, S.D., *Local monomialization of trancendental extensions*, Annales de L'Institut Fourier 55 (2005), 1517 – 1586.

[C5] Cutkosky, S.D., *Toroidalization of birational morphisms of 3-folds*, to appear in Memoirs of the AMS, AG/0407258.

[C6] Cutkosky, S.D. *Resolution of Singularities*, American Mathematical Society, 2004.

[C7] Cutkosky, S.D., *Strong Toroidalization of birational morphisms of 3-folds*, preprint, AG/0412497.

[CP] Cutkosky, S.D. and Piltant, O., *Monomial resolutions of morphisms of algebraic surfaces*, Comm. in Alg. 28 (2000), 5935 – 5959.

[CS] Cutkosky, S.D. and Srinivasan, H. *Factorizations of birational extensions of local rings*, preprint.

[D1] Danilov, V., *Birational geometry of toric 3-folds*, Math USSR Izv. 21 (83), 269 – 280.

[EH] Encinas, S., Hauser, H., *Strong resolution of singularities in characteristic zero*, Comment Math. Helv. 77 (2002), 821 – 845.

[E] Ewald, E., *Blow ups of smooth toric 3-varieties*, Abh. math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg 57 (1987).

[G] Grothendieck, A., *Revêtements etales et groupe fondamental (SGA1)*, Lecture notes in mathematics 176, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1970.

[H] Hironaka, H., *Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero*, Annals of Math, 79 (1964), 109 – 326.

[K] Karu, K., *Local strong factorization of birational maps*, J. Alg. Geom 14 (2005), 165 – 175.

[KKMS] Kempf, G., Knudsen, F., Mumford, D., Saint-Donat, B., *toroidal embeddings I*, LNM 339, Springer Verlag (1973).

[Mat] Matsuki, K., *Log resolution of surfaces*, to appear in Contemporary Mathematics.

[M] Moishezon, B.G. *On n-dimensional compact varieties with n-algebraic independent meromorphic functions*, Amer. Math. Soc Translations 63 (1967), 51-177.

[Mo] Morelli, R., *The birational geometry of toric varieties*, J. Algebraic Geometry 5 (1996), 751 – 782.

[N] Nagata, M., *Imbedding of an abstract variety in a complete variety*, J. Math Kyoto Univ. 2 (1962), 1-10.

[O] Oda, T., *Torus embeddings and applications*, TIFR, Bombay, 1978.

[S] Sally, J., *Regular overrings of regular local rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 171 (1972) 291 – 300.

[Sh] Shannon, D.L., *Monoidal transforms*, Amer. J. Math 45 (1973), 284 – 320.

[W1] Wlodarcyzk, J., *Decomposition of birational toric maps in blowups and blowdowns*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 349 (1997), 373-411.

[W2] Wlodarcyzk, J., *Toroidal varieties and the weak factorization theorem*, Inventiones Math. 154 (2003), 223 – 331.

[Z] Zariski, O., *The compactness of the Riemann manifold of an abstract field of algebraic functions*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., 45 (1044), 683 – 691.

[Z1] Zariski, O., *Introduction to the problem of minimal models in the theory of algebraic surfaces*, Publications of the Math. Soc. of Japan, 1958.

[ZS] Zariski, O. and Samuel P., *Commutative Algebra Volume II*, Van Nostrand, Princeton, 1960.

Department of Mathematics
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211